GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

-----:

IN THE MATTER OF:

•

SKYLAND HOLDINGS, LLC

: Case No.

: 09-03

:

Wodnogday

Wednesday, February 17, 2010

Hearing Room 220 South 441 4th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C.

The Public Hearing of Case No. 09-03 by the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened at 6:30 p.m. in the Office of Zoning Hearing Room at 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, Anthony J. Hood, Chairman, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairman

MICHAEL G. TURNBULL, FAIA, Commissioner (AOC)

PETER MAY, Commissioner (NPS)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN, Secretary DONNA HANOUSEK, Zoning Specialist ESTHER BUSHMAN, General Counsel JOHN NYARKU

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JENNIFER STEINGASSER MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on February 17, 2010.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WELCOME:
Anthony Hood, Chairman 4
PRELIMINARY MATTERS:
Sharon Schellin, Secretary
WITNESSES:
Eric Jenkins, Deputy Mayor's Office 8
Kenneth A. Davis, ANC-7B
Organizations & persons in support:
Karen Lee Williams, HCCA
Villareal Johnson, Washington East
Foundation
Eugene Kinlow
Julius Ware, Ward 7 Business &
Professional Association 62
Organizations & persons in opposition:
Ronald Mitchell 82
Mary Rose Green
Commissioner Robin Hammond-Marlin, ANC 7B. 90
Kimberly Jones 92
Yvonne Bing94
Fort Baker Drive Presentation:
Martin Sullivan
Joe Mehra, Traffic Expert 120
Ronald Cole 133
Gary Puckrein 144
Karen Siebert
Cynthia Brock-Smith
ADJOURN:
Anthony Hood 229

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

6:30 p.m.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is a Public Hearing of the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia on Thursday, February 17, 2010. My name is Anthony Hood.

Joining me are Commissioners May and Turnbull. We are also joined by the Office of Zoning staff Ms. Sharon Schellin and Ms. Donna Hanousek. Also the Office of Planning staff under the leadership of Ms. Steingasser and Ms. Brown-Roberts.

Again, just to reiterate, this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also webcast live.

The subject of this evening's hearing is Zoning Commission Case No. 09-03. This is a request by Skyland Holdings, LLC for approval of a Consolidated PUD and related Map Amendment for property located at Squares 5632, 5633, 5641, 5641-N, and various parcels.

And it is a continuation of our February 4, 2010 hearing.

Notice of today's hearing was published in the <u>DC Register</u> on October 16, 2009, and copies of that announcement are available to my left on the wall near the door.

The hearing will be conducted in accordance with provisions of 11 DCMR 3022 as follows: preliminary matters, report of the ANC 7B. Actually, we've done these things. We will be starting with ANC's presentation.

Again, organizations and parties in support; party in opposition, Fort Baker Drive; organizations and persons in opposition; rebuttal, and; closing by the applicant.

The following time constraints will be maintained in this hearing: Party in opposition, Fort Baker Drive has 60 minutes; organization has 5 minutes, and; individual has 3 minutes.

NEAL R. GROSS

The Commission intends to adhere to the time limits as strictly as possible in order to hear the case in a reasonable period of time. The Commission reserves the right to change the time limits for presentations if necessary. Note that no time shall be ceded.

All persons appearing before the Commission are to fill out two witness cards. These cards are located to my left on the table near the door. Upon coming forward to speak to the Commission, please give both cards to the reporter sitting to my right before taking a seat at the table.

When presenting information to the Commission please turn on and speak into the microphone first stating your name and home address. When you are finished speaking please turn your microphone off so that your microphone is no longer picking up sound or background noise.

The decision of the Commission in this case must be based exclusively on the

NEAL R. GROSS

1	public record. To avoid any appearance of the
2	contrary, the Commission requests that persons
3	present not engage the members of the
4	Commission in conversation during any recess
5	or at any time. The staff will be available
6	throughout the hearing to discuss procedural
7	questions.
8	Please turn off all beepers and
9	cell phones at this time so as to not disrupt
10	these proceedings.
11	Again, I want to apologize for us
12	starting a little late.
13	Would all individuals wishing to
14	testify please rise to take the oath? And
15	even if you were sworn in last time, let's
16	keep it clean; if everyone could rise.
17	Ms. Schellin, could you please
18	administer the oath?
19	(Witnesses sworn.)
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. At
21	this time the Commission will consider any
22	preliminary matters. Does the staff have any

1	preliminary matters?
2	MS. SCHELLIN: Just that we do
3	have Eric Jenkins here from the Deputy Mayor's
4	Office to testify, if we could take him up
5	first.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I'm going
7	to ask Mr. Jenkins if he would come forward,
8	and we'll take his presentation at this time.
9	Good evening, Mr. Jenkins.
10	Whenever you're ready. You might want to hit
11	your microphone.
12	MR. JENKINS: Good evening,
13	Chairman Hood and other members of the Zoning
14	Commission. My name is Eric Jenkins,
15	Development Manager in the Office of the
16	Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic
17	Development.
18	Since March 2009 I've been the
19	project manager for the redevelopment of
20	Skyland, with a brief break from the project
21	for a few months while on detail at another

agency. As project manager, I'm responsible

for overseeing all aspects of the Skyland project on behalf of the District.

I am pleased to be here tonight on behalf of the Deputy Mayor's Office to testify in support of the PUD application for the Skyland Shopping Center, as well as answer your questions concerning the Deputy Mayor's Office role in this project.

The concept of the Skyland project dates back a decade. Over the years that followed, the community has been actively engaged in developing the vision for the Skyland project. Additionally, starting in 2002 the Skyland Development Team has fostered a relationship with the community and presented their plan at various community forums for public comment.

The Skyland project is geared to promote neighborhood revitalization and economic growth on the 18 acre site located in Ward 7, comprised of those parcels of land bounded to the south by Alabama Avenue SE to

NEAL R. GROSS

the east, and north by Fort Baker Drive SE and a residential neighborhood along $30^{\rm th}$ Street SE, and to the west by Naylor Road SE.

Today the Skyland Shopping Center is in the C-3-A, R-5-B, R-5-A, and R-1-B Districts. The majority of the property is in the C-3-A District, and the requested map amendment would rezone the R-5-B, R-5-A, and R-1-B Districts to the C-3-A Zone.

While the Skyland Shopping Center is still active, a considerable portion of the shopping center is vacant and now contains either underutilized buildings with some buildings boarded up and vacated buildings, which presents serious safety concerns in the neighborhood.

The potential of this site is significant. Due to its prominent location at the intersection of Good Hope Road, Naylor Road, and Alabama Avenue the considerable land area available for redevelopment, and the resources and public benefits this project

would provide to the neighborhood.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Specifically, the Skyland Development Team's Development Plan calls for approximately 538,000 square feet of residential development or approximately 468 units, 448 apartments plus 20 townhomes; 315,520 square feet of retail development; 1,676 parking spaces.

Based on economic analysis conducted on behalf of a developer, the Skyland Development Team estimates the overall project will produce over 1,740 construction jobs and over 690 permanent jobs.

The payroll, sales, and real estate tax revenue on the present value of a 20 year period is expected to be over \$303 million.

Additionally, the Skyland Development Team has proposed a Community Benefits Package valued at \$9.2 million. Benefits include for example over \$2 million in traffic and public space improvements, and

a retail tenant build-out subsidy that will benefit local retailers who could otherwise not afford build-out costs.

The potential benefits of the Skyland development project to the Ward 7 community and the District at large are clearly significant. The economic development and the social and fiscal impact of a project of this magnitude would bestow considerable benefits to the residents of Ward 7, and the residents and visitors to the District in general, and should not be deferred.

The Deputy Mayor's Office position is that there should be no undue delay in approving the PUD application and realizing these benefits for the Ward 7 community.

Thank you for the opportunity to present testimony on this PUD application and I'll be happy to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much, Mr. Jenkins. We appreciate you and the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	Deputy Mayor's Office coming down to take the
2	time to let us know where you stand on this
3	particular case. Let's see if we have
4	any questions from any of my colleagues.
5	Okay. We have to do cross-examination, Mr.
6	Tummonds? Okay.
7	Commissioner Richards, do you have
8	any cross-examination? You do? Okay. You
9	can come forward.
10	Mr. Jenkins, you might have a few
11	questions you might have to answer.
12	And I think we have a few, right,
13	Commissioner Richards? I'm not going to start
13 14	Commissioner Richards? I'm not going to start off asking you how many but I'm just trying to
14	off asking you how many but I'm just trying to
14 15	off asking you how many but I'm just trying to get a reference.
14 15 16	off asking you how many but I'm just trying to get a reference. MR. RICHARDS: I'm going to keep
14 15 16 17	off asking you how many but I'm just trying to get a reference. MR. RICHARDS: I'm going to keep it down to as few as possible.
14 15 16 17	off asking you how many but I'm just trying to get a reference. MR. RICHARDS: I'm going to keep it down to as few as possible. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Can we basically
14 15 16 17 18	off asking you how many but I'm just trying to get a reference. MR. RICHARDS: I'm going to keep it down to as few as possible. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Can we basically go on his testimony?

1	response to what he testified to?
2	MR. RICHARDS: Yes.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
4	MR. RICHARDS: And maybe some
5	things that I thought maybe should have been
6	there but weren't.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, no. What you
8	can do when you come up we want to start
9	and end with this because this is what he
10	testified to.
11	MR. RICHARDS: If I go outside of
12	it, feel free to stop me. I do not intend to
13	go outside of it.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you
15	for your cooperation.
16	MR. RICHARDS: And no, I do not
17	have that.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Mr.
19	Jenkins.
20	Let me do this while you're
21	reviewing that. Mr. Sullivan, do you have a
22	copy of his testimony?

1	MR. SULLIVAN: No.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We have
3	another copy and you can review that if you
4	have any cross-examination. If you have any
5	questions.
6	MR. RICHARDS: Mr. Jenkins?
7	MR. JENKINS: Yes.
8	MR. RICHARDS: I wanted to
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: It's not on.
10	MR. RICHARDS: Is that better?
11	Okay.
12	Just a couple of questions. You
13	spoke about the area of land that's to be
14	rezoned. Are you aware of what the relative
15	values before and after the rezoning of that
16	land is to both the developer and to the city
17	in taxes?
18	MR. JENKINS: No, not
19	specifically. I can get that information in
20	terms of what the tax revenue is today, and
21	provide that to you in terms of what the tax

revenue is projected to be. I believe I

1	testified to that on an annual basis.
2	MR. RICHARDS: Okay. If you
3	would, would you submit that? And then I
4	won't even have to go down that line of
5	questioning.
6	Now, in terms of community
7	benefits, aren't there really two sets of
8	community benefits? There's that set, and we
9	call them community benefits, which are really
10	a part of the offer of the developer to the
11	Zoning Commission as to why this should be a
12	PUD, and what the using this as a unitary
13	development is a benefit to the city. That's
14	one set of community benefits, is that
15	correct?
16	MR. JENKINS: Well, what's your
17	second set of community benefits?
18	MR. RICHARDS: I didn't even get
19	to the second yet.
20	MR. JENKINS: Before I answer how
21	they differ, I
22	MR. RICHARDS: So your answer to

that question is there are two sets and they
differ?
MR. JENKINS: No. You posed the
question that there were two sets. I'm asking
I don't believe they differ. I believe
there's one set of community benefits. I'm
asking you if you could just be a little more
specific, and what your description is of a
second set of community benefits.
MR. RICHARDS: Okay. But what I
mentioned first was one set, right? That's
either a yes or a no.
MR. JENKINS: It's inclusive of
community benefits.
MR. RICHARDS: Okay. So that's
included in it?
MR. JENKINS: Correct.
MR. RICHARDS: Okay. So it's a
Venn diagram, that's half of the circle?
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner
Richards, I want you to be maybe my
colleagues might have understood that line of

1	questioning, because I would have to go with
2	Mr. Jenkins, the second set of amenities.
3	Let's do this; let's try this.
4	Let's ask a question; let's let him answer yes
5	or no. If it's no, then that's the answer.
6	Okay? So maybe that might help us speed up a
7	little more.
8	MR. RICHARDS: Okay. Now, there's
9	also a community benefits which are benefits
10	to enhance the community because of the
11	negative impacts of the project. Is that
12	correct?
13	MR. JENKINS: Let me just give you
14	what I think community benefits are, right?
15	MR. RICHARDS: I think that's a
16	yes or no question, isn't it?
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: But you asked him
18	a question and you asked him to answer it.
19	What we could do is turn his microphone off,
20	and we could let you ask and then you answer.
21	Let him answer. You want a yes or no; this
22	time he's not going to give you a yes or no.

1	He wants to go into detail in his response.
2	Let's give him a chance.
3	MR. JENKINS: So community
4	benefits are anything that the developer is
5	not obligated to do that would benefit the
6	community in general. And I think that's the
7	general view of community benefits.
8	Now, those fall in terms of if
9	they benefit the community at large inclusive
10	of the District, or specific neighborhoods, or
11	specific services. All of that is inclusive
12	of community benefits.
13	So community benefits has a very
14	broad and general application. I hope I'm
15	answering your question.
16	MR. RICHARDS: I have no further
17	questions.
18	MR. JENKINS: Thank you.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Thank
20	you very much.
21	Commissioner Richards, thank you.
22	Mr. Sullivan, do you have any

1	questions?
2	MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you. Hello,
3	Mr. Jenkins.
4	MR. JENKINS: Hello.
5	MR. SULLIVAN: You said that there
6	were \$9.2 million in community amenities or
7	public benefits, is that right?
8	MR. JENKINS: Yes. I'm saying the
9	developer has proposed \$9.2 million.
LO	MR. SULLIVAN: And you define that
11	as anything that the developer is not
12	obligated to do could be a public benefit? So
13	if they're obligated to do it, it's not a
L 4	public benefit for purposes of the PUD
15	process, is that right?
L 6	MR. JENKINS: Yes, yes.
L7	MR. SULLIVAN: So of the \$9.2
18	million, the \$5.6 million that is low impact
L 9	design Green features which DDOE claimed was
20	as required, isn't the developer obligated to
21	spend those funds?

MR. JENKINS: I haven't seen that.

1	I don't have access to that.
2	MR. SULLIVAN: If they were
3	required, if they were already an obligation
4	for a typical project?
5	MR. JENKINS: I'll stand by the
6	testimony that I gave.
7	MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. So if they
8	were obligated to do that otherwise, then it
9	wouldn't be a benefit?
LO	MR. JENKINS: I'll stand by the
11	testimony that I gave.
L2	MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. I guess
13	you've answered my question.
L 4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Don't look at me,
15	I don't have the answer for you.
L 6	MR. SULLIVAN: No, I
L7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: He's already said
L 8	he's going to stand by his testimony.
L 9	MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. Got
20	it.
21	Were you aware that \$250,000 of
22	the \$9.2 million has already been admitted to

1	not being supplied by the applicant but being
2	part of DDOT's project?
3	MR. JENKINS: No.
4	MR. SULLIVAN: Are you aware of
5	any other amounts that are on this list in the
6	\$9.2 million that actually aren't going to be
7	supplied by the applicant but will be paid by
8	the city, the taxpayers, or some other agency
9	besides the applicant?
LO	MR. JENKINS: No.
L1	MR. SULLIVAN: No further
12	questions. Thank you.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
L 4	much.
15	Mr. Jenkins, let me just ask I
16	know Skyland has been around for a while. I'm
L7	not sure how long you've been working on the
L 8	project. I think I might have asked that the
L9	first night. It's been a couple of years.
20	But let me just ask, I know
21	there's some reservations, maybe there's some
22	approval with a few restrictions, or some

things that some of the folks in the community would like to see with conditions. Has this project come to form to be further, I guess, bridging a gap? Because apparently at one point it was far apart. I'm sure that along with the Deputy Mayor's Office, the Office of Planning, and others have had charrettes with the community.

Two questions. Would you say that there's been a large involvement from the community and participation in what goes on there in Skyland? And also, has that gap grown closer to where we are today?

MR. JENKINS: Again, so I'll speak to my recent involvement. I, obviously, haven't been involved in this project over the 10 or so years that the project has been under way.

But my understanding is that there has been considerable outreach by the developer to the community. I personally have attended a number of community meetings where

NEAL R. GROSS

1	the developer has engaged the community in
2	what I thought was very productive
3	communication. In fact, even bringing models
4	to the community to look at what an actual
5	development would look like.
6	So I think there's been
7	opportunity for productive participation. And
8	I think those meetings have been productive,
9	yes.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. That's
11	really all I have. Thank you.
12	Colleagues, anything else?
13	Thank you very much, Mr. Jenkins.
14	We appreciate your testimony.
15	MR. JENKINS: Thank you.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me ask
17	Commissioner Richards, if you want to come
18	forward and give us your presentation? Mr.
19	Davis is going to do the presentation? Okay.
20	Yes. Commissioner Richards, you come sit at
21	the table with him. Is this one of your

fellow ANC Commissioners?

1 MR. RICHARDS: Former Commissioner 2 but he's the head of the Committee. 3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I think you 4 submitted something to that effect. 5 You submitted something? Good. Thanks for 6 reminding me. 7 And your name again, sir? MR. DAVIS: Kenneth A. Davis. 8 my light on? Kenneth A. Davis. I believe you 9 have a letter in the package there. 10 My name is Kenneth A. Davis. I'll be representing the 11 ANC-7B. I believe you have my testimony. 12 13 I'll be starting with the page that has 3012 on it. 14 15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Just give me 16 moment. Some of us are not as organized up here as others. Papers start getting mixed up 17 and I can't seem to find mine, but I do want 18 19 to follow you. 20 MR. DAVIS: Okay. CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm going to give 21 22 you this back. I found mine and I'm going to

1 take notes on it. Just bear with us. 2 I think we all have it in front of us. 3 Mr. Davis, if you could begin? 4 MR. DAVIS: Okay. 5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. 6 MR. DAVIS: Again, my is name 7 Kenneth A. Davis representing ANC-7B. 8 ANC-7B unanimously approved motion listing the conditions to be met by the 9 10 Skyland applicant in Zoning Case 09-03 prior to ANC-7B's recommendation for approval. 11 got a good pair of glasses on me so I can read 12 13 this. The conditions are as follows, one 14 15 of four: 16 (1)Provided that the applicant and Baker Drive residents execute 17 Fort Construction Management Agreement, bond, or 18 19 equivalent instrument to the satisfaction of 20 Fort Baker Drive residents, and provided that the developer otherwise reasonably meet the 21

concerns of the Fort Baker residents and the

ANC-7B.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

include This agreement shall mitigations of issues identified by the owner residents of the single family homes located on Fort Baker Drive SE directly behind and abutting the subject property. They have expressed concerns about the impact on their result of the proposed property as а redevelopment.

In particular, these residents significant concerns relative to the rezoning of of the the adjacent traditional R-5-A Zoned Districts to a much C-3-AZone District, more dense and development of 135,000 square foot formal retail store, and other high density uses and structures on land that is contiguous to these properties just a few feet from the single family homes.

(2) Provided that the applicant execute an agreement that meets the intent of paragraph FNS 2.7 of the 2006 Comprehensive

Plan concerning buffering.

Specifically, that plan says work with the property owners to develop and maintain a suitable visual, sound and security buffer between the Skyland Shopping Center and the adjacent residents on Fort Baker Drive.

The agreement shall reasonably meet the requirements of the Comprehensive Plan and the concerns of Fort Baker Drive residents and ANC-7B.

(3) Provided that the applicant shall continue to review the proposed design, location, and operation of the planned ramp in Block 1 rooftop parking areas with Fort Baker Drive residents and ANC-7B.

The goal shall be to determine the location further removed from the existing homes, and develop a design and operation plan that: The minimizes visibility of the ramp to the adjacent residential property owners to the north; minimizes the impact of noise generated by cars, trucks, loading; prohibit

traffic serving the PUD area from using 30th Street between Park Drive and Alabama Avenue.

The applicant shall take measures to restrict all residents and employees in the PUD obtaining local neighborhood from residential parking permits their or equivalent for parking in а residential neighborhood.

(4) Has to do with community benefits. The ANC feels strongly that the project amenities and public benefits be viewed in terms of Section 2403.8.

is Zoning That to say the Commission in deciding the PUD application must balance the offered amenities benefits against the incentives requested and development. impact of the the adverse Benefits and amenities are those items over and above the normal and legally required development activities.

In this case, the applicant should be required to submit to the Zoning Commission

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

final agreement with ANC-7B as specified amenities and benefits. These benefits and amenities could both detail the manner and legally required items proposed, and carry the weight of the PUD benefits granting the applicant and the negative impacts of the community by those concessions and overall development.

ANC proposed community benefits are attached and have been recently submitted to the applicant. However, we note that the ongoing activities and negotiations with the Fort Baker Drive may be cause for additional benefits.

And finally, be it resolved that the Advisory Neighborhood Commission hereby recommends approval of the PUD.

The last item is simply a listing of the 21 items that we consider community benefits.

And that is the end of my testimony.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you
2	very much, Mr. Davis. We appreciate your
3	succinctness in getting through your
4	testimony.
5	Commissioner Richards, did you
6	have anything you want to add?
7	MR. RICHARDS: No.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioners, do
9	you have any questions? Commissioner May?
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. I would
11	be curious as to what you think the current
12	package of benefits and the current state of
13	development are in comparison to what you're
14	requesting in terms of the conditions.
15	MR. DAVIS: The ones, the \$9.2
16	million that we heard earlier?
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: No. I'm
18	thinking from top to bottom, the Construction
19	Management Agreement and everything else.
20	Have you had discussions with the developer
21	about that; have they agreed to it?
22	We have a list of what the

1	benefits are right now, but I don't know
2	whether any other negotiations have occurred
3	and how things check off.
4	MR. DAVIS: No, they have not.
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Have
6	they met any of them?
7	MR. DAVIS: Yes. I guess there
8	are a couple of them that may be applicable.
9	And you're going to ask me which ones, so
LO	let's see.
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: That'd be
12	helpful.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You know what? I
L 4	was trying to refrain from asking, because I
L 5	look at this list that they have
L 6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, I guess
L7	I mean, the things that I'm
L 8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me do this.
L 9	COMMISSIONER MAY: Sorry.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me just say
21	this. 1 through 21, I want to give it some
22	time. Now I agree with your question but I

was trying to figure out how we can get some time so we can kind of see where they are -
COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- as opposed to

what we were given. Because I think you asked for some money from some schools and I see here there's a lump sum here --

MR. DAVIS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- and I see there are five schools here. So what I would try to do, and Commissioner May, unless you want to take the time to do it now, give them some time to do that.

And before we go back to the applicant you can come forward. I think that will give you some time. Take your time and figure out what matches what and what corresponds with what.

And then that way you can come back and tell us numbers 1, 2, 7, 9, 12, or hopefully it would be all 21; it would be nice if it was all 21 have been met. I'm sure

NEAL R. GROSS

1	it'll be 1 or 2 because I'm looking at
2	Commissioner Richards now. But let us kind of
3	know where you are. And I think that's in
4	line of questioning. You might not want to
5	have to answer this right now.
6	MR. DAVIS: Yes. Okay.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: But maybe we can
8	go onto some other questions, and that's one
9	of the questions that we'll come back to.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. I think
11	that's fine when it comes to the list of 21.
12	I guess I'm interested more in the other
13	conditions. I have a few follow-up questions
14	on that.
15	Have you discussed at all a
16	Construction Management Agreement with the
17	developer?
18	MR. DAVIS: I have not.
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: You have not
20	discussed it; it's never come up in a meeting
21	or anything?

MR. DAVIS: No. No, it has not.

1	This is a very recent development.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. I mean,
3	it's a pretty commonly proffered condition on
4	PUDs so I'm surprised that it hasn't come up.
5	MR. RICHARDS: We see that as
6	three separate things.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
8	MR. RICHARDS: There are the
9	things which are required by law, and some of
10	those the developers included in their list of
11	items into that \$9.2 million.
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
13	MR. RICHARDS: Then there are the
14	things which are required as a matter of law
15	for the PUD. And those would be the things
16	that make this as a PUD a more viable project
17	than separately development without a PUD.
18	And then there's the list of
19	things which are benefits to the community as
20	a result of the negative impacts. And their
21	list is really one and two, and ours is really
22	three if you look at it in that context.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think I know what you're -- these four here, I think there are four major things --

MR. RICHARDS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- that they had here other than the long list. And I think we can do those four. Because I'm not sure if I understood that answer.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. I'm not sure I'd necessarily cast it exactly the same way.

certainly of Ι mean, some things that you're talking about in that third a Construction class, such as Management Agreement, you would regard as mitigation for impacts to the community. However, as I said before, that is something that is commonly proffered as an amenity of a project under the PUD. So it could really fall into that second class if it had been discussed and negotiated and agreed to and all that, because we can only act on what's being proffered. We don't

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 demand things or negotiate things; we 2 react to what's proposed to us. We prefer 3 that these things be negotiated, and it's 4 presented to us and the community is 5 agreement. That's the ideal situation. Let me move on to the next 6 one 7 which I have a more specific question 8 which is the number 2 with regard to buffering 9 for Fort Baker Drive. We had some significant discussion of that so far. And I'm wondering 10 is what specific reaction to the 11 your distances, to the way the project has been 12 13 modified, to the planting plans, the walls, all of the things that are being done to 14 15 of those mitigate some impacts that 16 describe under number 2? MR. DAVIS: Still unacceptable. 17 COMMISSIONER MAY: Still 18 19 unacceptable? you have any specific Do 20 suggestions on what you'd like to see there? MR. DAVIS: Distance. I think 21

NEAL R. GROSS

that's --

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: The property is
2	only so big, right? The property is only so
3	big. I mean, you can only push things so far
4	away.
5	MR. DAVIS: Well, we've seen a
6	plan a few years ago that was some 100 feet
7	back, didn't go into the ravine at all. So
8	it's certainly possible.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. And what
10	about the changes that were done to Block 1
11	and the way that was moved back? That's your
12	condition number 3. What's your reaction to
13	that?
14	MR. DAVIS: Well certainly what
15	was done in Block 1 may be adequate but it's
16	still too close, if you follow me.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
18	MR. DAVIS: Okay.
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: So it's better
20	but not good enough, in your view?
21	MR. DAVIS: Yes.
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Those

1	are the more specific things that I had
2	questions about. That's it for me.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
4	Commissioner Turnbull?
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you,
6	Mr. Chair.
7	I guess my only the first two
8	pages, the four conditions are your
9	conditions. But what's this third page with
10	like 21 items; what does that represent?
11	MR. DAVIS: That represents a
12	condition also in the sense that we would
13	expect some community benefit, and I
14	understand that word hasn't been defined but
15	at least our definition of community benefits,
16	for the adverse impact of the development on
17	the community. And we'd like some
18	consideration for that, so we've listed that
19	as a condition.
20	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Could you
21	tell me how item 13 represents an adverse
22	impact is doing something to mitigate an

adverse impact? I just don't understand how providing free wireless high speed capacity for housing and business throughout the life of the development represents mitigation of the impact of project. I think that's a wishlist. We'd all like that. I'd like to get free internet for the rest of my life, too. But I mean, isn't that going beyond the intent of what the amenities are?

I mean, I think we have to be realistic with amenities. I really think that amenities have to get to the heart of the community, and looking at a PUD how it comes in and what it does. I think at some point we have to come to grips with real issues.

To me, this thing seems to go beyond the intent of what an amenity is. I mean, I understand we like to get as much as we can. But I think we have to draw a line on some things and really look at what's the heart of the issue, what's the meat of the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	problem here, and what can we do to ameliorate
2	the concerns of the community and the
3	citizens.
4	MR. DAVIS: I certainly
5	understand. I don't have the exact rationale
6	as to why that was put in.
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
8	MR. DAVIS: It was designed by
9	Committee, but
10	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I
11	understand. Thank you.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I thank
13	Commissioner Turnbull with your line of
14	questioning especially for the 21. I heard
15	Commissioner May on the four.
16	I think if we could kind of look
17	at 13 and say, is this really realistic?
18	Because at the end of the day we have to
19	balance this. And we'll have to balance the
20	amenities with what's being asked for.
21	I think what I would encourage Mr.
22	Davis and Commissioner Richards for you to do

1	is, as I've asked, just look at that 21. All
2	of it's realistic, I would love to have these,
3	too. But from our standpoint, help us to help
4	you.
5	The ones that you feel: Okay.
6	That's really not realistic. Maybe we can get
7	this another way. I would ask that you do
8	that. So when we come to our deliberations it
9	would make our deliberations a lot easier.
10	MR. RICHARDS: Could we have a
11	week or two to put that together?
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Out of the 21 and
13	you'll come back with it shaved off?
14	MR. RICHARDS: Yes.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You asked for
16	MR. RICHARDS: We would also like
17	to sit down with the applicant and discuss it
18	with them, and see what their views are.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: This hasn't been
20	MR. RICHARDS: They've seen this
21	but there have been no discussions with them
22	about this.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You haven't had
2	any discussions on these four points or the 21
3	points?
4	MR. RICHARDS: That's right.
5	These were approved at our meeting on November
6	17, which was just before we began filing
7	things for this hearing. And we have not had
8	a meeting with them since then. So it would
9	probably be appropriate for us to sit down
10	with them.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. I will
12	tell you that I would encourage that, but I
13	will say that I'm not mandating anybody to
14	meet. But it would be nice. In those two
15	weeks it would be great with the stipulation
16	if you come back with just five on the list.
17	Now, that was a joke. That was a joke.
18	Okay. Any other questions?
19	Does the applicant have any cross-
20	examination?
21	Thank you. Mr. Tummonds.
22	MR. TUMMONDS: Thank you, Mr.

1	Davis

On November 20, 2009, Exhibit 25 of the record, the applicant submitted a Development and Construction Management Plan.

Did the ANC have the opportunity to review and comment on that Development and Construction Management Plan?

MR. RICHARDS: Yes. We've reviewed it but we have not commented on it.

MR. TUMMONDS: Okay. Last question I have I think is a follow-up. an enhanced question to what Commissioner May asked. Condition number 3 with regards to the revisions to the designed location and operation of the parking ramp for Block 1.

Has the ANC reviewed the January 21, 2010 submission of the applicant where that parking ramp was internalized to address issues regarding sound? Does that address the concerns raised by ANC-7B?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ DAVIS: We looked at it and it does not.

1	MR. TUMMONDS: No further
2	questions.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Tummonds, help
4	me. What exhibit was that, the Construction
5	Management Plan?
6	MR. TUMMONDS: Exhibit 25 of the
7	record. It was in our November 20, 2009. It
8	was the same filing that included our rèsumès.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Good.
10	Thank you.
11	Okay. Mr. Sullivan, do you have
12	any cross-examination?
13	MR. SULLIVAN: No questions.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.
15	Okay. Thank you very much for
16	your presentation. And we're going to work on
17	the two weeks that Commissioner Richards has
18	asked for. We're going to work on that and
19	see, so stay tuned. Let's try to get that
20	together.
21	Okay. I got my last minute
22	instructions. We're going to now call for

1 organizations and persons in support. We have 2 a few. 3 I'm going to ask Gary Gold -- no, that's opposition. Okay. 4 She has it so the 5 Xs and the Os and the squares -- got it so 6 nice for me and I still messed it up. Okay. Let me do this. 7 8 In support, Karen Lee Williams or Marvin Bowser? Okay. You can come forward. 9 10 Deborah Jones? Charmaine Thomas? If it sounds like it's your name, believe me, 11 I've messed it up so if you can come forward. 12 13 Mr. and Ms. Wade? Okay. So right now who I should 14 15 have at the table is Karen Lee Williams or 16 Marvin Bowser, looks like it's Williams. Deborah Jones, is Deborah Jones here? 17 Charmaine Thomas? She's not here; we have her 18 19 testimony. Mr. and Ms. Wade; we have their 20 testimony. Richard Evans? Do we have his testimony? Probably. Okay. 21

NEAL R. GROSS

Who?

Villareal.

1	MR. JOHNSON: Villareal.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Villareal, I'm
3	sorry. Excuse me. Johnson, 7A. Forgive me.
4	I think I noticed Eugene Kinlow.
5	Is Mr. Kinlow here?
6	And the last one, I'm sorry. I
7	don't even know where to start. Can you help
8	me? Number 32.
9	MS. SCHELLIN: It looks like the
10	last name
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Julius Ware. I
12	would have never got that.
13	MS. SCHELLIN: I'm going to put a
14	sign up that says, "Please print."
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. So
16	that's all I have right now. Is there anyone
17	else here who would like to testify in
18	support?
19	Okay. Let's begin with Ms.
20	Williams, and we'll just go to my right.
21	Start with Ms. Williams and go right down the
22	line.

MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. I'm Karen Lee Williams, President of the Hillcrest Community Civic Association, and I reside at 2914 W Street SE. The reason that's important even though that's not in my testimony is that I live at the corner of W Street and Fort Baker Drive. So the impact on Fort Baker Drive, except my house is not at the ravine site with the same view, will be -- the same conditions will affect my property.

The mission of -- we are here -- well, Marvin is not here so I will skip that.

We speak today on behalf of Hillcrest Community Civic Association. The mission of HCCA is to enhance the quality of life prosperity of the residents, and families, community organizations, businesses, and institutions within our boundaries. fulfills its mission in part by advancing the interests of our members before the government leveraging and private sector, and collective influence to achieve community

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

improvements.

The HCCA represents more than 400 households in Ward 7. The boundaries are Pennsylvania Avenue SE from 31st Street to Southern Avenue, Southern Avenue to Naylor Road, Naylor Road to 27th Street, 27th Street and Naylor Road to Pennsylvania Avenue and 31st Street. Skyland is the major commercial area located within our geographic boundaries.

There are five major points we would like to convey to the Zoning Commission on why we support the Skyland Town Center development and the development team Skyland Holdings, LLC.

First, Hillcrest and its residents have been the catalyst, visionaries, and champions for the Skyland redevelopment for more than 15 years. Initially Skyland, a major shopping area serving our section of the city, was falling prey to neglect, and we worked to revitalize the shopping center. In 2000 we started making a case to former Mayor

Anthony Williams for a brand new Skyland Shopping Center.

Second, HCCA members in large numbers have participated in every public and community process to help shape this project into a proposal for a prominent shopping center, living, and gathering place to meet the needs of our thriving community.

We have provided compelling testimony at every City Council proceeding to make a successful case for the \$40 million in city financing.

We successfully led the fight against the effort by the private owners to prevent revitalization by proposing to use historic preservation of unqualified buildings.

We also helped make a successful case for the use of eminent domain as a means for the city to purchase the property for revitalization process.

Though we are disappointed as a

NEAL R. GROSS

community by the pace of the project due to the legal entanglements associated with eminent domain, we acknowledge the steady progress on the project by the city government and the Development Team.

Third, Gary Rappaport and his partners were selected through a competitive process. The Development Team has become a valued partner in our community. We have worked with them for 9 years and know them to be open, forthright, and accessible.

Thus far, they have lived up to all their commitments. They have supported community causes and projects over the 9 year period. We have monitored other projects developed by members of this team and have been pleased with the outcomes of these venues.

The Development Team has listened to our concerns and has been responsive to our needs in changes in design. HCCA has become confident they will build a high quality

project as planned. We are also confident they will continue to be responsive to the needs of those property owners who live on Fort Baker Drive in close proximity to the development who have legitimate and documented concerns about the effect of the development on the stability of their homes.

We will actively work with Rappaport to ensure that the team continues to be a good neighbor through every phase of the Skyland project, through completion and beyond.

Fourthly, HCCA enthusiastically supports the town center mixed-use retail and residential project as designed. We feel it will compliment and upgrade our existing community.

We have publicized the design of the project and related materials on our website and through our listserv for many years, in addition to having a presentation on the final design, the PUD application, and the

NEAL R. GROSS

Community Benefits Package in February 2009.

We think the Community Benefits

Package is a good one. Its provisions are

consistent with the goals and priorities of

HCCA.

Most importantly, we feel HCCA and other members of our community have a relationship with the developer that will allow us to work together to produce a final package that is accessible to all parties.

In closing, the HCCA is the entity that made the compelling case for construction development of the Skyland project before the District government 2000. We have provided leadership and support in the community before the government, and in support of the Development Team consistently since that time. organization Our hosted no less than 50 Skyland updates at our Association meetings over the past 9 years. And we have presented testimony at every public meeting sponsored by the executive

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

branch, NCRC, or the City Council, 1 2 participated in numerous sessions sponsored by 3 the developer over this period. Also be advised that our Board of 4 5 Directors passed a resolution in support of 6 this project in May 2007. This resolution 7 remains in effect and is attached if you want 8 a copy. 9 Thank you for this opportunity to testify and I will be happy to answer any 10 questions. 11 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me first 12 13 and I appreciate Ms. Williams going over her Because what she did was she set the time. 14 15 bench mark for everybody else. So I want to 16 be fair. Williams, I 17 Ms. gave you an additional roughly about another minute. 18 19 So I want to make sure I'm fair to 20 everyone else, whether you're in support or opposition. We will give you another minute 21

if you so choose to take it. If not, when you

1	hear the bell you can stop, but if not you'll
2	have another minute. Because you set the
3	groundwork, so you all can thank Ms. Williams.
4	Typically at 3 minutes we usually cut it off
5	but since I let Ms. Williams continue, we're
6	going to be fair.
7	MS. WILLIAMS: That's all I want
8	to say.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. You had 5
10	minutes but it rang, so really you went to 6.
11	But that's okay, keep up the good work. Hold
12	your seat and let's go let me get it right
13	this time.
14	Mr. Villareal Johnson? Did I get
15	that right?
16	MR. JOHNSON: Almost. It's like
17	Rumpelstiltskin, you've got three more tries.
18	It's Villareal.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I might strike
20	out.
21	MR. JOHNSON: It's Villareal. The
22	problem is that people try to pronounce how it

looks, but it's not that way.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, I will tell you, it's written down here twice. I guess you wrote it and I'm not sure who else did. And we have a question mark behind it because we were trying to figure it out. So next time, you ought to help us out and print.

MR. JOHNSON: No problem. I'll do the enunciation next time for the spelling.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

MR. JOHNSON: Good evening. opportunity for granting me this present and voice my opinion. My name is Villareal Johnson. And it is truly a great day for the residents of East Washington. It's a great day because we move closer and closer all-inclusive comprehensive to an development project worthy to our liking.

As a native born in the Hillsdale community of Ward 8 and as a current Ward 7 resident, I am elated to say let's move forward and make this a reality. For too long

we have yearned for a development of this magnitude.

I can remember as a youth bussing to the shopping center for fast food and use of the Post Office. Now I look forward to shopping for quality retail items and dining at white table restaurants, and visiting friends who will call this home.

I am aware that there are a few who are not satisfied and feel the need to protect their vested interests as well as personal interests. I support that as well. However, the good of the majority must prevail. We need this development as it will greatly improve the quality of life for all residents east of Anacostia.

The project will bring quality of life amenities like needed goods, services, and of course jobs. God knows in this economy we need jobs.

I know that this will increase the density of the area. But increased density

NEAL R. GROSS

means more tax dollars and more opportunities to have true community development, and improved social conditions for residents.

I have participated in many of the charrettes, in addition to being a member of the Washington Youth Foundation. I have also chaired the Housing and Economic Development Committee for Marshall Heights Community Development Organization.

Ι know that this project will many opportunities to improve present life of residents quality of east Anacostia River. Ιt will also give opportunities for persons from other parts of the city, as well as Maryland, as well as Virginia to know what we already know. that's Ward 7 and Ward 8 is a great place to live, work, shop, and eat.

So please, let's move forward and let's resolve any concerns that would affect persons in the immediate area. Let's find amenable solutions. Let's get a win/win. But

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

by all means, let's get this done. And let's get this done for the good of the whole and prosperous community.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Kinlow?

MR. KINLOW: Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Eugene Dewitt Kinlow and I'm here to share brief comments in support of the Skyland Town Center concept. I'm also here to urge you to move this plan from concept to reality.

For the record, I'm a lifelong resident of the District of Columbia and Ward 8, and I've resided in Ward 8 for over 40 years. I reside at 3952 2nd Street SW.

I have personally attended numerous Skyland development community meetings over a number of years. I see widespread support for the redevelopment of Skyland based on a tremendous need for goods,

NEAL R. GROSS

services, and jobs in our River East communities.

Support for this plan is tied to the thought that our community deserves more than the meager selection of services amenities that we currently have. We deserve a well thought out concept on this 18 acre site that delivers access to services, amenities, and jobs. Our community deserves a proper mix of national brand retailers, neighborhood-serving shops, restaurants, and affordable and quality housing. Such a mix provide greater stability could communities and add much needed dollars to our tax rolls.

It goes without saying that such a plan must be well thought out and address community concerns. I and the community support a plan that incorporates landscaping, trees, shrubs, and environmentally friendly buffers to meet high environmental and protection standards for the site.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

In regard to transportation elements, I support the proposed improvements to the street and traffic, including improved pedestrian crossings, traffic signals, and improvements at the various intersections.

Ι also encourage continuous а dialoque with the DC city government evaluate enhanced transportation planning efforts over time. The developers have worked with the District government and understand that they continue analyze as to transportation and traffic issues and propose additional improvements including parking.

believe that the Skyland Town development is consistent with Comprehensive Plan, land use, and urban design I am confident that the provisions. And developers will protect the property and views of the Fort Baker Drive neighbors. I urge the Commission Zoning to approve this plan expeditiously.

Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Mr Kinlow.

Mr. Ware?

MR. WARE: Good evening. My name is Julius Ware. I'm the President of the Ward 7 Business and Professional Association. We are the defacto Chamber of Commerce for Ward 7. And we support this project for a number of reasons. This evening I don't have written testimony, so I'm just going to bullet it out.

We support this project for the over 700 businesses in Ward 7, the 60 plus CBE businesses in Ward 7. We feel that this project will offer jobs and contracts to those within the footprint and the Ward.

We believe that the track record and the history of the Development Team has proved that they have the community's best interests at heart that they do work in, and that they do in fact provide good community benefits. We're confident that the team will exceed best efforts to provide and include

these opportunities to Ward 7 businesses.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

certain We're the will team distinguish between benefits to the city --I've heard а lot of conversations But we feel confident community benefits. that this team will distinguish community, will break them into two categories, distinguish those benefits that impact city and those that impact the ward, and highlight those so that the ward residents can readily understand that these benefits are impacting them.

We feel confident that this development project is good and that this Development Team will assist us in walking up to a bid.

We feel very confident that this Development Team will identify tangential opportunities. For example, opportunities on other projects that they have that the team is participating in, that they will identify those opportunities for the businesses and

jobs for the residents. And when those opportunities are available that they will promote them through their partners so that the community can see that they are in fact good developers.

We believe that this team is innovative and that they will practice that innovation, excuse me, as they attempt to address the community benefits as various groups like the ANCs and other organizations have laid out.

heard For example, I mention about wifi. Well, OCTO currently is engaged in a project of bringing broadband to all areas of city. the The Obama Administration has also identified stimulus And dollars. feel that we these are opportunities where the Development Team can be innovative and identify those opportunities that they don't necessarily have to carve out their own money, but that they will partner with those entities that are already out there

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	to address many of these community benefits.
2	We encourage the Zoning Commission
3	to expeditiously approve this. And we want to
4	thank you for this opportunity to testify.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Mr.
6	Ware.
7	I want to thank this panel for
8	your testimony. We may have a few questions.
9	Commissioner Turnbull?
10	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you,
11	Mr. Chair.
12	Ms. Williams, thank you for being
13	here.
14	You represent a lot of homeowners
15	with HCCA.
16	And I guess this is directed to
17	all of you, how much input have you had or
18	discussions with the ANC-7B? I sort of see
19	ANCs asking for other you haven't really
20	been asking Ms. Williams for more amenities
21	than what the applicant has asked for. But
22	the ANC has seemed to be reaching out looking

for a few other things.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Are you in sync with what the ANC is looking for? I guess I'm just wondering where the dialogue is between the ANC and you folks.

MS. WILLIAMS: ANC-7B and Hillcrest Community Civic Association has a lot of dialogue. As a matter of fact, at every monthly meeting we invite ANC-7B representatives to be part of our meeting. So there is a lot of overlap.

Hillcrest Community Civic Association came to a resolution earlier than ANC-7B.I can't speak for their specific community benefits. When did we our resolution in 2007 we did not address the issue specifically of community benefits. as an organization we have not gone back to readdress that issue. We let them address that issue.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. Mr. Ware or Mr. Kinlow?

MR. KINLOW: I just think that over time this plan has grown in terms of its concept and its scope. There have been times I think in the past where the community and the ANC were probably closer and probably on the same page. But the Development Plan has migrated into some new territory.

And I think that the dialogue is still there, but there's just a difference in opinion on some points. But I think that they can be worked out in the end. I think they can all be worked out.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I'm just trying to think that we're trying to get to project. closure on the And I'm wondering, at some point are you going to meet with the ANC? I'm looking at the applicant. I'd like to from quess а community standpoint resolve as quickly as we can the outstanding issues so that we can go forward.

MR. WARE: Mr. Turnbull, if I may, the Business Association is actively engaged

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

in doing an overview of community benefits. We're having conversations to, if you will, develop a framework for community benefits for projects. And we haven't reached out to the developers or the ANCs, but we feel very confident that the developers, the team as it's constituted right now, will actively participate in this process. And many of the benefits, as I attempted to point out, can be addressed. There are overlapping requests.

We feel that working together demonstrating, as this Development Team has demonstrated on various other projects and I'm very confident that they will on this one, many of to address these community benefits and assist the community, as well as working through those issues similar to when the Senate and the House come together. And they have, you know -- yes, thank you. have a conference and they work through these issues because they have the same goal. we have to work through these issues.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So I'm saying that I feel very confident that this team will participate in that process and demonstrate goodwill throughout.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Turnbull, just if I could take a stab at it. I've looked at this project from different lenses for a while now. I'm trying to understand what would be your concern. Are you looking for more of the same from the two groups?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, Ι didn't really hear from any of you any concern about lack of amenities on the part of the You felt comfortable, I think, applicant. with the direction of the project, other than the wifi which you brought up as a possible stimulus item. But the ANC has clearly got some caveats for their approval of the project which go beyond what the applicant has originally proposed. So I'm just wondering, if you're representing the community in the meetings with the ANC, I see a little bit of a

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

splinter going on. I'm just trying to see how far apart you really are.

MR. JOHNSON: I would think that ANC-7B is looking at it with a different lens. I don't think it's a negative thing. I am also an ANC Commissioner but I'm just for 7A.

And throughout my involvement and awareness in this process -- I'm here of capacity of Secretary course in the Washington East Foundation. And of course as a part of the Skyland Development Team we have taken avenues to incorporate what the people of the area wanted. ANC-7B has their population of people that they're representing and they have their different lenses. agree that there should be, if possible before this thing hits the final slate, that there should be a conversation to see where the rubber could meet the roads and we could be on the same page across the board as much as possible.

But there must be note that there

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

have been attempts at conversations between the different groups to do such. But again, they have the right to have their opinion and their perspective.

And it's not that we're not agreement across the board. I think for the most part you will hear that everybody wants this done. How is always going to be the It's difficult part. democracy; it's political process. It's an economic development action item. Ι means there's But I think for the going to be differences. most part, except for the little variances, it's the same.

was just trying to get to a point. And I know the Chair often talks about trying to get closure on issues and get to a point where this body, this Zoning Commission can look at things and feel that we have everything before us, and feel that we've got the interests of the community at heart here. So that was my

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

only concern.

MR. KINLOW: Let me just say that I think this process is a lot like making sausage, right? There's a lot of different parts to it but the negotiations are still ongoing. I think the doors are open, the conversation is still going on.

And there will be, I believe, a product that serves the needs of all the stakeholders in the community whether it's businessowners, residents, those folks who feel a direct impact on the value of their property or their quality of life. And you'll see a lot of those things, I think, taken care of in the short term. So I think the process of negotiations is still going on.

MS. WILLIAMS: I just want to say I agree that the ANC and HCCA have a very open relationship. And we can sit down and work out any differences, I think, move everything--

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: So you

might be looking at their list?
MS. WILLIAMS: Yes. Well, I
haven't seen it yet. That's
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
Thank you.
MS. WILLIAMS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Good
questions.
Commissioner May?
And one of the reasons that we try
to encourage applicants, ANCs, and community
folks to come closer together because at the
end of the day in Ward 7 I live in Ward 5.
My colleagues up here, we don't live in Ward
7. You're the ones who are going to have to
endure. You're the ones who have been at the
table.
And I'm going back to something
Mr. Johnson just said, and I'm going to ask
this question of some people who come up in
opposition. He said that everybody wants to

see something done and I guess it's whatever

lens -- I don't know if I'm exactly quoting
you correctly directly, but if I'm not you can
cut me off.

think at the end of the day, we're trying to balance to get the win/win for you, the applicant who has come to the neighborhood and wants to develop the community, who's going to be there for the life of the project or even longer. just think that it's -- the way we see it right now, it's all over the place. And for the 9 or 10 years that we've been working on it and I'm hearing the people say they haven't this document or haven't that seen seen And it just shows you. document.

We only get, what, two or three?
This is our third hearing or second? They all
run together. This is our third one. Thank
you.

So that's about how much time we get. We get a packet on Thursday. And some people I think have been working on this for 9

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

years; we've been working on it for a few weeks. So we try to make the best informed intelligent decision we can, first of all for Ward 7 residents and the applicant, and then for the city as a whole. And that's what we're grappling with.

So we were hoping, and I think, Turnbull, you can correct if I'm Mr. me incorrect, we try to get that gap closer Because Mr. Turnbull, Mr. May and together. myself, and my other colleagues who are going to participate, we like to try to get the neighborhood and the applicant together before we make the decision. So that's where we are.

And I will say this. For 9 years and for all the time you've been working on it, I'm just kind of set back a little bit when I hear that people say that they haven't seen this document, haven't seen that document, or this hasn't happened. I'm trying to figure out, 9 years, what's been happening?

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. JOHNSON: Well, that's the funny thing about projects that take a decade and longer. You have different players that come in at any given point of time, different leadership roles, different changes. There's been recent changes with ANC-7B in particular. There's been changes with the leadership of HCCA. There's been changes with Marshall Heights Community Development Organization.

A lot of people who start this project won't necessarily finish. And those who come in the end, those who come in the middle, granted, they offer variance. But the bottom line, hopefully when this is all said and done, this community wants this project and they want this project to be the best project that it can be.

Now, we understand that there are individuals that are affected because of their personal property interests or what have you. We've got to resolve that because they do have a right to maintain what's theirs. But

NEAL R. GROSS

the good of the whole should persevere, it should exist and work for everybody, you know, Ward 7, Ward 8, the city as a whole.

We have to do this in a manner that a win/win is achieved. And a win/win does not necessarily mean everybody gets everything they want. But if the majority gets a quality development that works, it's okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And again, the closer we can get together, we understand that roles change. I personally have been on the Zoning Commission for over 12 years, so I know how that stuff works. This is not my first case and I understand.

But again, what Ι think Mr. Turnbull is alluding to -- and I'm saying this for everybody, not just for you Mr. Johnson, but for everybody. The closer we get together, the easier our jobs are to a certain point. Because we still have some rigs that we have to look at when we deal with this case

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	and we deliberate. And it's not always if
2	this street gets that or this neighbor gets
3	this, the ANC must we have some regulations
4	and the Code that we have to look at when we
5	resolve this.
6	But anyway, it seems like we're
7	moving forward with this hearing tonight. Let
8	me see if there's any other questions, because
9	I think this is going to be it tonight. Okay?
10	All right.
11	Thank you all for your testimony.
12	Wait a minute, hold it, cross-examination. I
13	shouldn't have said that.
14	Does the applicant okay. No
15	cross.
16	Commissioner Richards, do you have
17	any cross-examination?
18	MR. RICHARDS: No cross-
19	examination.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Mr.
21	Sullivan, do you have any cross-examination?
22	Okay. Thank you all very much.

1	Great discussion.
2	Let me just ask is there anyone
3	else who would like to testify in support and
4	I didn't call your name? Okay. Thank you.
5	We're going to go to opposition.
6	Before we do this, Mr. Sullivan,
7	I'm going to ask for a favor of you. And you
8	can refuse me if you want to but I'm going to
9	ask. What I would like to do is before we do
10	the party status in opposition, will you be so
11	kind as to let the individuals go that are in
12	opposition? And we can get through them, and
13	that way we can end with your presentation.
14	MR. SULLIVAN: Sure. No problem.
15	Yes.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you
17	very much.
18	MR. SULLIVAN: Sure.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Mr.
20	Sullivan and the Fort Baker Drive party has
21	agreed to let the persons in opposition go

first. And we don't want to keep having you

1	come back down just in case we have to have a
2	very narrow scope hearing again, which I hope
3	we don't have to because I think the hour is
4	still early. 8:00, okay.
5	Let me call individuals in
6	opposition. Gary Gold? I'm going to call
7	your name twice and if it sounds like your
8	name, just come forward. Gary Gold? I don't
9	see Mr. Gold.
10	Ronald Mitchell? Come forward.
11	Tiffany Brown? She testified at
12	the first hearing? Thank you very much.
12 13	the first hearing? Thank you very much. Okay. Great.
13	Okay. Great.
13 14	Okay. Great. Michael Witherspoon, CVS?
13 14 15	Okay. Great. Michael Witherspoon, CVS? Dorothy Brown?
13 14 15 16	Okay. Great. Michael Witherspoon, CVS? Dorothy Brown? Cynthia Brock-Smith? Okay. Ms.
13 14 15 16	Okay. Great. Michael Witherspoon, CVS? Dorothy Brown? Cynthia Brock-Smith? Okay. Ms. Smith.
13 14 15 16 17	Okay. Great. Michael Witherspoon, CVS? Dorothy Brown? Cynthia Brock-Smith? Okay. Ms. Smith. John Faai? F-A-A-I?
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Okay. Great. Michael Witherspoon, CVS? Dorothy Brown? Cynthia Brock-Smith? Okay. Ms. Smith. John Faai? F-A-A-I? Mary Green? Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

1 Sullivan, is your group going 2 to testify as a panel or how -- okay. 3 got you. Okay. Is that all we have? That's it. 4 5 You know what, Commissioner Marlin just -- I saw Commissioner Marlin; I'm not sure if she's 6 7 in support or opposition. 8 Are you in opposition or support Okay. Well, here's 9 of this project? thing, you're on. So you can come on up, 10 Commissioner Marlin. 11 Echols? Anyone by the last name 12 13 of Echols or first name of Echols? That's all is Echols; I don't want 14 we have to be 15 disrespectful. I'm not seeing Echols. 16 We have one more. George, you're not going to testify? 17 How many more individuals do we 18 19 have here that want to testify in opposition? 20 I see just one. This is going to be Okay. the last call. I see just one, now I see two; 21 22 can we make it three? Okay. We don't have enough room but for two. We have three seats?

Okay. Any other person who would like to testify in opposition?

Okay. Right after this, Mr. Sullivan, we'll take the Fort Baker Drive group.

All right. Let's go back and see who the first person was. Mr. Mitchell, if you could start, and then we'll go to the young lady here to my left. And then we'll start with Commissioner Marlin to my right, and we'll go down to my right after Commissioner Marlin. Okay?

Mr. Mitchell, you may begin.

MR. MITCHELL: I, Ronald Mitchell, 2904 Alabama Avenue SE, Washington, DC am appearing here at the Zoning Commission hearing today to oppose the application of Skyland Holdings for Planned Development and Zoning Map Amendments of Skyland Town Center, from 2626 Naylor Road SE to 2846 Alabama Avenue SE.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	I have questions concerning the
2	proposed site:
3	(1) If the site consists of
4	approximately 18.7 acres and redevelopment
5	plans include 500 units of housing, what type
6	of housing could fit on 18.7 acres of land?
7	If my math is partially correct by dividing
8	18.7 acres by 500, and converting acres into
9	feet and feet into square feet; this would
10	not, in my opinion, leave room for people to
11	really live in. Okay.
12	(2) I have never had a definite
13	explanation as to where housing will be
14	situated on the proposed site. Will the
15	developer clear up my concerns? These
16	concerns include entrances, parking, public
17	alley access, and traffic congestion. This
18	includes additional noise.
19	(3) Will the development answer to
20	my satisfaction the proposed retaining wall
21	behind certain units? Is this an attempt to

dam up the flow of an existing stream with the

retaining wall? I have ecological concerns as
to the impact the retaining wall will have on
the watershed and woodland areas directly
opposite to this wall.

All right. I did this on December

-- the first meeting. So I have some
additional stuff I want to put in to be done,
since I've got a couple more minutes. Let me

Who negotiated a land deal for the people of the District of Columbia for such a low bid price for a developer to develop Skyland properties? The developer has stated it will only cost him or her \$225 million to develop, and the developer will collect revenues in the future.

Okay. If I can get these in -- okay.

This property must be renegotiated for the people of the District of Columbia for at least \$1 billion.

Where is a long term commitment for long term job creation?

I say no to the developer unless

NEAL R. GROSS

see.

more money upfront is given to the District of Columbia.

Why is it the people's land is being given away for such a low bid price? After all, the eminent domain was the rule of order used to secure this land deal. Zero for the District, 100 for Skyland development.

Okay. And a few weeks ago, the landscaper for the Skyland properties listed the fact that he thought the black locust trees were sort of a nuisance type of tree. Well, I'm referring to a Herbert Zim, a noted botanist, the late Herbert Zim of the University of Chicago who writes about the black locust.

Black locust is a tree valued as an ornamental for street planting as well as a soil binder, which is badly needed there with that erosion taking place, and stabilizing eroded land. It is a --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Mitchell, I'm going to have to cut you off because we gave

NEAL R. GROSS

1	you your time and an extra minute.
2	MR. MITCHELL: That's okay. I
3	just wanted to
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: But just hold
5	tight. We may have some questions from your
6	research. Just hold tight.
7	MR. MITCHELL: All right.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Where am I?
9	Ms. Green? Ms. Brown? I'm sorry, your name?
10	I'm going to go to Commissioner Marlin third.
11	Yes, you're next. I'm sorry, what's your
12	name?
13	MS. GREEN: Mary Green.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Green? Okay.
15	You can go ahead and begin, Ms. Green. We'll
16	get it, unless you want us to follow you.
17	We'll follow you. Turn your microphone on,
18	Ms. Green.
19	MS. GREEN: How's that?
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's good.
21	MS. GREEN: Okay. My name is Mary
22	Rose Green, and I have three lots on Fort

Baker Drive totaling 70,666 square feet, or about 1 and a third acre. I produced a map in my file folder so you could follow along.

I have Lots 46, 47, and 63, Parcel 213. These three lots have extensive frontage on Fort Baker Drive and 28th Street SE. Lot 46 has frontage on both 28th Street and Fort Baker Drive.

entities listed above, which are corporations which I wholly own, abut parcel -- these three lots abut the large parcels that are part of the PUD. And that is Lot 52 which has 4.71 acres, and Lot 60 which has 16,250 square feet. I've included a topographic survey of Parcel 213, Lots 46, 47, and 63, which are in the lower part of Fort Baker Drive.

I have extra copies of these if you are still -- he's giving them out? Okay.

The above referenced properties include the 4.71 acres, which is 205,220 square feet known as Lot 52. These were part

NEAL R. GROSS

of an assemblage under unified ownership consisting of 31 properties and totaling 8.7 acres.

The District of Columbia seized 28 of the 31 properties. They did not take the three lots on Fort Baker Drive, which are Lots 46, 47, and 63.

The 31 properties containing 8.7 acres are in current litigation and the ownership which was unified still contends that they own the properties, even though the District has taken them by eminent domain.

Out of the 8.7 acres of land owned or controlled by Mary Rose Green, the District has seized 7.27 acres. Current ownership status is in litigation with the District. Litigation is now in the fifth year regarding ownership, valuation and other issues.

I'm now reading on page 2.

An inventory of the 28 properties taken and the three lots untaken is attached, and their description is in a separate

NEAL R. GROSS

schedule in your packet.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

In litigation in Superior Court of the District of Columbia I have maintained illegal, and that seizure is that the ownership of the seized entire 28 properties still vests in the names of Mary Rose Green and the corporations. The parties litigation, namely NCRC which is now District, have been in litigation since July 3, 2005, almost 5 years since the supposed quicktake by the District. In its complaint the District maintained that even though it had no funds in July 2005, a quicktake was it could commence development necessary so immediately. It later deposited --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Green, I will tell you that we have your testimony and I'm going to have to cut you off. We gave you an additional minute. We do have your testimony. We may ask a few questions. If not, we do have your testimony.

Okay. Commissioner Marlin?

NEAL R. GROSS

MS. HAMMOND-MARLIN: Hello. Good evening. I'm testifying in opposition to some of the supportive testimony that was given here during the last hearing. For example, the testimony given by the Office of Planning as it referenced the parking spaces.

I do not feel that the parking spaces that are being suggested by the Office of Planning will be sufficient to accommodate that location based on the traffic flow. And also, this development abuts my Single Member District which is Good Hope Marketplace.

I found it really insulting that the Office of Planning would come up with a proposal like that for an area that is so heavily congested as it is with traffic flow.

And the idea of having a bus station, a bus -- what is it, where you can buy the Metro or something, buy the Metro fares and that kind of thing? A kiosk, thank you. Would be maybe the first of its kind in the city. I don't think they need to start at

that location, at the intersection of Alabama and Good Hope Road and Naylor Road.

I just think that it's too congested there. There are already pedestrian and traffic concerns in that corridor.

And I think if the Office of Planning took the time to come out and talk to the ANC, and talk to the community to find out what exactly their proposal would involve and how it would impact us, I think they would have come up with a better resolution if they're looking for means for the citizens to enter and exit that shopping center.

The other thing I'd like to put on record is that I am in support of the ANC's position in ensuring that the residents of Fort Baker Drive, the contingencies that they're asking for are met. We have talked about those in sessions. And I don't think that they're unreasonable, given the impact of the development and some of the ramifications possibly the development could have on their

NEAL R. GROSS

1	properties. I know I would be concerned.
2	But overall, I am in favor of the
3	project. It's been at least I've been
4	involved at least 10 years with the project.
5	We started with wanting that land revitalized
6	and we are where we are now. But in efforts
7	to try to enhance our community, I think we're
8	going in the correct direction.
9	But I think that we just need to
10	try to work out some of the differences that
11	the community has with the Development Team.
12	And I think we can move forward in a positive
13	manner. Thank you.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
15	much.
16	If you can introduce yourself, I
17	don't think I have your name. The last two
18	ladies, I don't have your names.
19	MS. JONES: Good evening. My name
20	is Kimberly Jones, and my comments will be
21	brief but heartfelt.
22	Good evening, Commissioners. I am

1	a lifelong resident of the Hillcrest
2	community. I was born at and am now the owner
3	of 2916 Fort Baker Drive. And I'm here to
4	state my absolute opposition to this project
5	in its current form.
6	I understand that the Ward 7
7	Business Association and HCCA are in support
8	of it and are supposedly speaking as
9	representatives of the community. But I
10	believe that the issues that we have on Fort
11	Baker Drive are weighty and significant, and
12	perhaps are more serious than what the
13	community at large sees as economic
14	development and growth.
15	So I just want to say that I
16	strongly urge a consideration of rescinding
17	the proposal. Thank you.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you,
19	Ms. Jones.
20	Next?
21	MS. BING: My name is Yvonne Bing
22	and I am a resident of Fort Baker Drive. I

submitted a letter to the Commission on February 4 by fax opposing the PUD in its current form. And at this time I would like that letter to be entered for the record. I don't know if you have that letter.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. We do have it and it was faxed. I can't put my hand on it right now, but we do have it and I will look for it. Did you want to add anything else?

MS. BING: Well, the only other thing that I wanted to add is that we met with the developers. And they indicated to us that they were willing to have a company monitor the vibrations during the construction phase. And when I looked at the Construction Plan, that was not a part of that plan.

So I don't know if that was an oversight or if they're not willing to do that now. But that was one of our main concerns, the noise, the vibration, the traffic, the environmental impact, etc.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Did you have
2	anything else that you wanted to add? Okay.
3	I want to thank you all. We may
4	have some questions.
5	Let me go right back to you, Ms.
6	Bing. Say that we were able to have the
7	applicant, and they heard you just now, put
8	that in the Construction Management Plan,
9	would this change your position to support?
10	MS. BING: No. Because an
11	environmental impact study was not done beyond
12	the site.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me go
14	down this a little. I'm probably going to go
15	into some dangerous water here because we
16	don't deal with environmental impacts. But
17	let me ask you this, if that was done, would
18	that change you to support?
19	MS. BING: If an environmental
20	impact was done?
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. If those two
22	things that you just mentioned were done,

1	would that change your position to support?
2	MS. BING: What would change my
3	position to support this project?
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Maybe
5	that's the way I should have asked the
6	question.
7	MS. BING: Right.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you
9	for helping me.
10	MS. BING: Okay. So the thing
11	that would change my position is if they would
12	come to the residents of Fort Baker and put
13	everything on the table. Because from this
14	point on things have changed, and we haven't
15	really seen at this time what the project is
16	going to look like.
17	If they would do like a balloon
18	study that I could see from my house what the
19	project would look like, how tall it's going
20	to be, the scale. I can't really tell from
21	the models they've brought to us, and those

models from what I understand have changed.

1	So we don't know what the project looks like
2	at this point.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you,
4	Ms. Bing.
5	Commissioner Marlin, you mentioned
6	the Office of Planning. Hasn't the Office of
7	Planning been involved with because you're
8	a Commissioner with 7B, am I correct?
9	MS. HAMMOND-MARLIN: ANC-7B05.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: ANC 7B05? Hasn't
11	the Office of Planning been out there involved
12	with those charrettes; haven't they been out
13	there?
14	MS. HAMMOND-MARLIN: I don't think
15	so. I don't recall them being out there.
16	Now, I did have a conversation with Ms.
17	Roberts, and I went back to look for an e-
18	mail. She did attend one of our ANC meetings
19	but it was on a different project.
20	Now, there's a couple of ANC
21	Commissioners in the audience. I don't
22	remember them coming to one of our community

1	meetings to discuss Skyland, or having a
2	charrette, or even being at one of Gary's
3	meetings.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
5	MS. HAMMOND-MARLIN: I can't
6	remember.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm just curious,
8	Skyland has been around for a while. And I'm
9	just
10	MS. HAMMOND-MARLIN: I'm sorry.
11	It has. I've been involved at least 10 years.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm shocked that
13	it seems like nobody from what I'm hearing
14	from those in opposition, or even period
15	the way the perception is, and my colleagues
16	you can help me if I'm misinterpreting this,
17	it sounds like nobody's mentioned it sounds
18	like you haven't been as a community. But the
19	applicant has presented to us that they have
20	had many charrette.
21	MS. HAMMOND-MARLIN: The applicant
22	has. I thought your question to me was

1	specifically Office of Planning.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. The Office
3	of Planning. But what I'm hearing now, if
4	nobody is saying that the Office of Planning
5	hasn't been there; somebody else testified
6	they haven't had a chance to talk with the
7	applicant.
8	MS. HAMMOND-MARLIN: Well, the
9	applicant has been very forthcoming with us.
10	They've been to
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Forthcoming with
12	you all? Okay. With the ANC?
13	MS. HAMMOND-MARLIN: With the ANC.
14	And also, they've had community charrette.
15	We had one at Winston Elementary School years
16	ago. I can't say that in fairness to them,
17	they have been out to the community and they
18	have met with the ANC. And we've had meetings
19	with them concerning community benefits.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So they've shown
21	you models; you've seen what the project is
22	going to look like; you know the position of

	Block I? Those are the kind of things that
2	I'm hearing. Because I think Ms. Bing, you
3	just testified
4	MS. BING: Let me clarify that.
5	I've been to a lot of their meetings. But it
6	was in a conceptual stage, so things have been
7	changing. And as I said, today we don't know
8	what that project really is going to look
9	like, and like the levels, and what it's going
10	to look like from our homes, and things of
11	that sort.
12	They have been meeting with us.
13	But I don't think it's clear to all of us what
14	the real impact is going to be.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Bing, I'm
16	going to try to help you. Because of the
17	questions of the Commission I think in our
18	first hearing, we asked for some stuff and I
19	think we got it. So maybe it just takes
20	maybe they can show you what the Commission
21	has asked for.

have that,

and

They

22

it was

1	actually presented to us at the February 4
2	hearing. And I don't know if you were here
3	but it was presented to us then. Because we
4	asked some of the questions, how does it look
5	from Fort Baker Drive, and that was presented
6	to us. Okay? I'm sure they have it handy. I
7	don't know if we have it handy but they have
8	it handy. That may help.
9	Okay. I'm trying to bring this
10	together, here, before we because you all
11	are the ones that live in the community, and
12	that's where we are.
13	Any questions?
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, I
15	have one question for Commissioner Marlin.
16	If I understood you correctly, you
17	were saying that you didn't agree with the
18	Office of Planning's suggestion with regard to
19	parking. And the reason was because you were
20	concerned about congestion.
21	MS. HAMMOND-MARLIN: Correct.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. So I'm a

1	little bit confused.
2	MS. HAMMOND-MARLIN: Okay.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: You don't want
4	the parking reduced, right?
5	MS. HAMMOND-MARLIN: Correct.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: More parking
7	means more cars means more congestion. So
8	what congestion are you concerned about?
9	MS. HAMMOND-MARLIN: Well, see, in
10	my mind and I'll preface it by saying I
11	just waited an hour and a half for a bus and
12	then I had to get on the subway. So I don't
13	really agree with public transportation as the
14	way to go.
15	And I think that if you're going
16	to a shopping center, and this is me speaking
17	and then I'll speak as a Commissioner, you
18	should have the option of being able to drive.
19	I don't think that, especially an
20	agency if you will, the Office of Planning
21	should come out and dictate to us that we
22	should not have certain ample parking spaces

when they haven't been out to a meeting. And I don't really know if they even surveyed the area outside of sitting at their desk and looking at something they've read.

COMMISSIONER MAY: But I'm just confused. Tell me more about the congestion aspect. What is it? I mean, you're worried about where cars might park or you're worried about the number of vehicles on the street?

MS. HAMMOND-MARLIN: Well, when I "congestion," I that say mean that intersection is already congested in terms of retail. We have, you know, the Good Hope and then of course Marketplace, we have Skyland which we're talking about. there's a couple of other stores there and a couple of other businesses.

I think most people are going to want to drive. And I think there should be ample parking spaces so that you can park, and it doesn't spill over onto neighborhood streets which aren't far away; 30th Street is

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	there. And then spill over into the parking
2	that's provided at Good Hope Marketplace.
3	I see no logic to having a
4	shopping center with insufficient parking
5	spaces, and then you're counting on people to
6	get on a bus to come do their shopping.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. All
8	right. Thanks, and I understand what you're
9	saying.
10	I guess a sort of general comment
11	I had on some of the questions that came up
12	just in the testimony of several of the
13	witnesses right now is an unfamiliarity with
14	the project and with the drawings.
15	I think it was Mr. Mitchell, is
16	that right? You raised questions about the
17	number of units and what it's going to look
18	like and all those sorts of things, and I'm
19	wondering why. We've received reasonably
20	accurate drawings and they were updated for
21	the February 4 hearing. And I'm wondering if

information has

this

same

shared

been

1	consistently with the community, and whether
2	you've seen the same drawings that were
3	presented here in the first hearing back in
4	December or the earlier February hearing.
5	So if anybody wants to say yes or
6	no or whatever, what you've seen?
7	MR. MITCHELL: Yes. Starting with
8	the December

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.

MR. MITCHELL: -- hearings. But before that I was not aware of how they would -- even though I attended a meeting at Fort Baker Drive where these gentlemen did present us with a mock-up of how the proposed site would look, it seems to me that I'm still not clear as to how this place is going to be really laid out.

empathize with that. It's a lot of information to absorb, particularly when you don't do it all the time. And I do it all the time and I still have to struggle sometimes to

NEAL R. GROSS

1	absorb it all. But my concern is whether it's
2	actually being out there.
3	MS. BING: We did not see the
4	current drawings from the February 4 meeting.
5	We have not had another meeting with
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: When was the
7	last time you saw drawings?
8	MS. BING: November.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: November?
10	Okay. I think the set that we have, I don't
11	know if I have the date on it or not. Does
12	anybody offhand know what the date of that
13	submission was? This had to have been earlier
14	than November. September 21 is what
15	they're telling us this is from. So you
16	probably saw the same set of drawings that
17	we're working from. The only thing that might
18	have changed is the changes that they made to
19	Block 1, which we saw on February 4.
20	So I think that we should be
21	relatively in sync in terms of drawings. So

that was my basic question. Thanks.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. May, are you
2	looking at Exhibit 20? Is that Exhibit 20,
3	the latest one?
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.
6	Thank you. When did we get this?
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: It was with the
8	hearing package. It was a hearing submission,
9	I think.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Did we get it at
11	the last meeting or did we get it prior?
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: No. We got it
13	in December. Yes. The only thing we got at
14	the last meeting was the small package, I
15	think.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. Okay.
17	This is what we got at the last meeting.
18	Because that was what was given to us to show
19	the views.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Because I remember
22	Commissioner Keating had mentioned that he had

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	gotten this and he was okay with it.
2	Okay. Any other questions of this
3	panel?
4	And Ms. Green not Green, is it
5	Green? Okay. Ms. Green. I saw your issues
6	but some things are not within our
7	jurisdiction, what's going on in the court,
8	unfortunately.
9	MS. GREEN: I didn't get to the
10	heart of the letter. The letter was about the
11	water flow on Fort Baker Drive.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Why don't
13	you take a minute and tell us about that, and
14	we'll read it.
15	MS. GREEN: Right now the water
16	from the large parcel, or most of the PUD,
17	flows to the Fort Baker Drive side because
18	there's a ravine. And Mr. Duke of Mr.
19	Rappaport's, who is the civil engineer for Mr.
20	Rappaport, did testify that there is a soil
21	there but he's never seen any water in it
22	unless it rains.

1	And when it rains all of Fort
2	Baker Drive, 30 th Street, and the PUD
3	properties have rain water and they flow onto
4	my land. And they flow I have, as I said,
5	1.3 acres. And the swale which is on my land
6	carries all the water. I have looked at Mr.
7	Rappaport's plans. He does have storm water
8	management. But the exact plan of storm
9	management is not in the plans submitted here.
10	My concern is that you're going to
11	continue to use my property as a depository
12	for the rainwater.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
13	MS. GREEN: That's my concern.
	_
14	MS. GREEN: That's my concern.
14 15	MS. GREEN: That's my concern. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I've got
14 15 16	MS. GREEN: That's my concern. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I've got you, heard you loud and clear. Thank you.
14 15 16	MS. GREEN: That's my concern. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I've got you, heard you loud and clear. Thank you. Any other questions of this panel,
14 15 16 17	MS. GREEN: That's my concern. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I've got you, heard you loud and clear. Thank you. Any other questions of this panel, colleagues?
14 15 16 17 18	MS. GREEN: That's my concern. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I've got you, heard you loud and clear. Thank you. Any other questions of this panel, colleagues? COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I guess I

1	it sounds like the community still hasn't seen
2	a lot of these revised drawings that we've
3	seen, and there's still some confusion as to
4	what the project really looks like. I'm not
5	sure whether the applicant needs to have
6	another meeting to do show and tell.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: I think
8	certainly what we're hearing tonight is enough
9	feedback to know that further interaction
10	between the applicant and the community would
11	probably be a very good thing for the project.
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: But what I got
14	from the questioning was that the most recent
15	version of the plans that we have were shown
16	at a community meeting as recently as
17	November. And so it had to have been pretty
18	much the same drawings. So they're not far
19	out of sync necessarily, but they're not
20	necessarily
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: We got to take

1	home big thick packets and
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: study them
4	to our heart's content. And I'm not sure that
5	level of information was handed to everyone at
6	those meetings.
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.
8	Yes.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: So it's a lot
10	to absorb even if you have this.
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I would
12	agree.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So the good part
15	about it is the ANC meets tomorrow night, so I
16	think that's why we're doing a whole lot here.
17	And we can press things forward, I think.
18	Now, I didn't say that you had to have them
19	there tomorrow night. I'm just saying, I
20	think if we can press things forward we can
21	hopefully the meeting has been cancelled?

So we could have won our --

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: You mean I
2	missed volleyball?
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: He missed helping
4	his team win. So you have to see ANC; we have
5	to go out there one night.
6	MS. SCHELLIN: They have no
7	parking because of the snow situation.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. Okay.
9	MS. SCHELLIN: And the sidewalk.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.
11	But anyway, I think one of the things that we
12	and it goes to the question of Ms. Bing.
13	We were given this and this shows views.
14	And I would think that at some
15	point it's very unfortunate the ANC's not
16	meeting tomorrow night. And I understand the
17	reason why; we all do in this area. But
18	anyway, I think some of those questions can be
19	answered.
20	And I would just say to Mr.
21	Tummonds, you don't have to respond now.
22	You'll probably say, "Why are they asking us

to do that? We've been out there a 100 times." I've been here long enough to know you've probably been out there a 100 times. But the key is we want to make sure everyone understands, because some of that opposition may go away.

But even at that, at the end of the day the Commission is going to make a decision. And we want to try to make decision that while we're not going to satisfy everybody, but we're going to try to make the best informed and educated decision that we possibly can. And I think sometimes if you ease some of the concerns, I think it just makes things flow a little easier. You might not get everywhere where everybody wants to But I'm sure, Mr. Tummonds, you've been be. around a while and I'm sure that you all will do what you can do to help my colleagues get a comfort level. Even though we might not get everywhere where everybody wants to be, but we can get as close as we can.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	All right. Enough lecturing.
2	Where did I leave off at? Okay. Cross-
3	examination.
4	Does the applicant have any cross-
5	examination?
6	Commissioner Richards, do you have
7	any cross-examination? Okay.
8	Mr. Sullivan, do you have any
9	cross-examination?
10	Is this our last panel for
11	opposition? Okay. Good. All right.
12	What I will do is I would like to
13	take a 3 minute break. My colleagues and I
14	will take a 3 minute break, which means it's
15	going to be 5 minutes. And we'll be right
16	back, and we'll get started with Fort Baker
17	Drive.
18	Let me thank this panel, too. I
19	appreciate it.
20	(Whereupon, at 8:41 p.m. off the
21	record until 8:49 p.m.)
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay We're going

1	to go ahead and try to get started with the
2	opposition Fort Baker Drive's presentation.
3	Meanwhile, Commissioner Richards is going to
4	be trying to help us coordinate a date. So we
5	appreciate you working on that while we are
6	hearing the presentation.
7	Okay. Mr. Sullivan, if we're
8	ready?
9	MR. SULLIVAN: We're ready. We
10	have a preliminary matter. We'd like to
11	qualify a traffic expert as a rebuttal witness
12	for traffic. We submitted a preliminary
13	report with our statement in opposition on
14	December 10, and Joe Mehra's CV was included
15	in that. And I believe he's been before this
16	Commission before, or the Board.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. Mr. Mehra is
18	transportation, right? That's what you're
19	proffering him as?
20	MR. SULLIVAN: That's correct.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I've
22	actually seen Mr. Mehra before we proffered

1	him, I know, on the BZA. I'm not sure about
2	the Zoning. But probably on the Commission
3	also.
4	Okay. Any problems? Okay. So we
5	will do that. I don't see any objections, so
6	we'll do that.
7	Thank you, Mr. Sullivan.
8	MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. Thanks. I'd
9	like to start with a short statement and then
10	we'll move right into the testimony.
11	My name is Martin Sullivan. I'm
12	here on behalf of the Fort Baker Drive party.
13	Good evening, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners.
14	The applicant has the burden of
15	proof to justify the granting of the
16	application according to the PUD evaluation
17	standards in the regs. And the upcoming
18	testimony will help to show that the applicant
19	has not met that burden.
20	A quick point on the big picture
21	before we move forward with the testimony. I
22	think, Chairman Hood, you said it best when

you said the PUD process should be win/win. And that's the beauty of the process that theoretically everybody wins. Or at least if not everybody gets to win, nobody loses too much.

Well, here we have a situation where my clients are about to lose too much. In effect, my clients are being asked to take one for the team. And they will be defacto investors in this project with no chance of a return on that investment.

They're certainly going to their privacy, their peace, their quiet, and the their character of single family neighborhood. Not just from the structures that will be а literal stone's throw away from their homes, but also by the increased traffic both cut-through and in the general area. That alone is more than any one resident homeowner should have to sacrifice.

But in addition to these concerns, the residents also have a reasonable belief

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that they could literally lose their homes as a result of the applicant's apparent lack of concern for the soil erosion and stabilization conditions on what was known as God's Dump.

You've heard the applicant, and probably OP as well, claim that storm water management and soil erosion issues are of no concern to the Commission, and everybody can pass the buck to DCRA. But the regs require otherwise of this Commission, as does the Comp Plan very specifically. So we believe the Zoning Commission should weigh in on this point.

The applicants, like many others in this community, do support the revitalization of the Skyland Shopping Center in accordance with the original vision and in accordance with the Comp Plan sections that call for a "community-scale retail center," rather than the Skyland renewal on steroids before you now.

My clients understand that this

NEAL R. GROSS

project is popular but they have faith in the legal process that their property will be protected.

Based on the applicant's dealings with the Fort Baker Drive party, we think the applicant believes that this Commission's approval is a forgone conclusion. And that mind-set shows in among of areas applicant's traffic study the feeble and attempts to mitigate the visual impact of this project on these homes, and also in applicant's message to just trust them, that their construction activity won't damage these homes.

If the current proposal passes, it's a complete disaster for my clients and they have no choice but to try to save their homes and their biggest investment.

If there are no questions I'd like to proceed with the testimony of Mr. Mehra. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Typically what we

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

do is you finish your whole presentation and we ask our questions on the end.

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you.

MR. MEHRA: Good evening. I'm Joe Mehra and I'm going to talk about the traffic study that was conducted by the applicant and documented in the Traffic Report by Gorove/Slade.

The traffic study follows generally accepted industry guidelines for conducting a traffic impact study. However, there are several assumptions that were made to arrive at the conclusions which are no longer valid because of the assumptions. Some of these discrepancies and shortcomings of the traffic analysis will be presented by me.

In terms of the study area intersections, they analyzed intersections that were very adjacent or almost adjacent to the site. There was only one intersection that was further away that they analyzed which is Branch Avenue and Alabama Avenue.

NEAL R. GROSS

The figure eight of the traffic impact study shows that 35 percent of the site traffic, 35 percent which is more than one-third, will be coming on Naylor Road to and from the north. However, no intersection was analyzed along Naylor Road.

Similarly, 25 percent of the site traffic will be coming on Good Hope Road to and from the north. Again, no intersection was analyzed along Good Hope Road. The intersection of Good Hope and Minnesota Avenue should have been included in the analysis. And DDOT in their report had similar concerns.

In terms of the existing conditions, the traffic data was collected back in the year 2006. The analysis that was done using that data was done in year 2008.

Since then I guess you can say 3 years or 4 years have passed, and typically for a traffic impact study the data has to be no more than 1 year old. These are the standard industry guidelines that have been

NEAL R. GROSS

documented by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. At the least, the applicant could have collected data at one intersection in the year 2008 or thereabouts to verify that the traffic growth has been minimum since 2006 when the original data was collected.

In terms of the levels of service, you've collected the traffic data, then you analyze using the synchro model to compute the levels of service. The synchro model worksheets were included in the report as an appendix. These worksheets had very limited data in it.

For example, critical information such the lens signalized cue at as intersections were not reported. Basically, the intersections are so close to each other that anytime the cues exceed a certain number of feet, it will spill back into the adjacent intersection. But this information was not provided.

Further, there's a big difference

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

in comparing the actual model results which are included in the appendix and the summary results which are included in the body of the report in Table 1. For example, the vehicle delay for the intersection of Good Hope Road and Naylor Road was reported as 60.2 seconds per vehicle, whereas the model actually came up with over 76 seconds of delay which is almost 27 percent higher.

Similarly, the vehicle delay for the intersection of Alabama Avenue and Naylor Road was reported as 39 seconds per vehicle, whereas the model actually showed 50 seconds, almost 28 percent higher.

After you've done the existing conditions analysis, then you move to the background. The background is the future traffic without the site being developed. Again, the synchro model was used to compute the level of service.

The industry practice is to use the same signal timings and phasings as the

NEAL R. GROSS

existing conditions unless the signal phasings have been changed due to geometric conditions. Further, most of the signals are generally on a coordinated system. Changing a signal timing at one intersection can impact the overall system. Changes should not be made unless DDOT concurs with the changes.

Ιt that Gorove/Slade seems timings changed signal at several intersections in the background conditions in comparison to the existing conditions. The signal timing changes have actually resulted in the background conditions operating better than the existing conditions due to individual intersection signal timing change, even though there is an increase in traffic volumes.

An example is the intersection of Avenue and Naylor Road. The 50.2 Alabama vehicle delay in existing seconds per 39.8 conditions decreases to seconds vehicle in the background conditions.

After you do the background

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

conditions analysis you compute the generation from the site traffic. Gorove/Slade used the Trip ITE Generation Report to compute the a.m. and p.m. peak hour trips, and reduced them to account for pass-by trips, synergy reductions, and alternate mode reductions.

by trips is reasonable. In terms of reduction due to synergy, Table 6 of Gorove/Slade's report shows that almost 46 percent of the vehicle trips leaving the apartments in the p.m. peak hour are going to on-site retail. That means approximately half the people when they leave their homes in the evening, they go to the retail on the site itself. There is no justification for using such a high synergy factor.

Table 6 in the report also shows that the vehicle trips to and from the site were further reduced by 30 percent due to the Naylor Road Metrorail station located

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

approximately 1 mile from the site. Further,

Gorove/Slade refers to the WMATA 2005

Development Ridership Survey as a source for
this percentage reduction.

And I quote from the Traffic Report, "Using the models provided in the study and given the distance from the Naylor Road Metrorail, a 30 percent reduction was applied to the residential and commercial trips." End of quote.

A review of this WMATA study shows that all residential and commercial sites that were in the study were within approximately on-half mile of a Metrorail station, not 1 mile. No sites were 1 mile away from the station.

Further, this WMATA study showed that the Metrorail most shared for residential uses was 31 percent or one-half mile distance from the station, as shown in Table 11 of the WMATA report.

Further, this WMATA report shows

NEAL R. GROSS

that the average Metrorail most shared for all retail sites, all retail sites in the study sample was 29 percent. All study sites were within 1,700 feet of the Metrorail station, which is a quarter mile. Not, again, 1 mile from the Metrorail station.

The use ofreasonable acceptable reduction factors for synergy trips shared trips will result and most increase of vehicle trip generation shown in Table 6 of the Gorove/Slade report. daily basis approximately 13,000 vehicles will be entering and exiting the site. This is more than the total traffic that is currently traveling on Good Норе Road and Alabama Avenue.

After the site traffic is added, Gorove/Slade computed the levels of service. And as noted earlier, the signal timing should have been the same as the existing conditions or the background conditions. Gorove/Slade changed the signal timing at most of the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

intersections in analyzing the levels of service.

In some cases the clearance intervals were reduced when analyzing the levels of service. Clearance intervals is a very significant safety issue. You cannot reduce clearance intervals unless you reduce the road rivets.

The traffic study as well as DDOT has emphasized the need to accommodate pedestrian crossings and pedestrian safety in the traffic analysis. The levels of service analysis does not incorporate an increased pedestrian activity. level of The incorporation of the increased pedestrian activity can reduce the intersection levels of service.

The traffic analysis has the following shortcomings:

(1) It did not incorporate critical intersections in the analysis even though a significant portion of the site

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	traffic will be passing by these
2	intersections;
3	(2) Made some assumptions that are
4	clearly invalid in terms of vehicle trip
5	generation. Correcting for these assumptions
6	would result in an increase in site trip
7	generation;
8	(3) The levels of service analysis
9	has not used the signal timing consistently
10	with the consequence that background
11	conditions are projected to be better than the
12	existing conditions even though there are no
13	roadway improvements and there is an increase
14	in traffic;
15	(4) The clearance intervals have
16	been reduced in comparison to the existing
17	conditions data;
18	(5) The use of the correct data in
19	trip generation, pedestrian activity, and
20	levels of service analysis may result in
21	several more intersections failing with the
22	site traffic.

Due to the above listed shortcomings, the traffic results are invalid and cannot be used to assess the site impacts.

Due to the close proximity of the various intersections, cueing will result in overlap and block adjacent intersections.

MCV developed the AMP Single Car Model using traffic data and signal timing from the Gorove/Slade report for the total conditions with the site developed. I'm going to present to you the simulation of the traffic through the road reenactor for the a.m. peak period. The time period that you will see is approximately 8:00 a.m.

That's the intersection of Branch Avenue and Alabama Avenue. This is kind of the overall network. And this is Alabama Avenue. And then you have Good Hope, Naylor, and there's the site.

What you are seeing is the simulation using the traffic data, the signal operations, and timing that Gorove/Slade had

NEAL R. GROSS

1	in their report. This does not incorporate
2	the increased traffic that would have resulted
3	if correct information was used.
4	As you can see, this is a
5	simulation of real world conditions where this
6	is a traffic signal. The red means that these
7	three approaches are red and you have the
8	leading green.
9	This is the intersection of
10	Alabama and Branch Avenue. This is the
11	traffic heading westbound towards 30 th Street.
12	As you can see, it's already backing up all
13	the way onto Branch Avenue. And I guess this
14	one, the slide doesn't go far enough but the
15	Alabama Avenue approach is also backing up
16	quite a bit here. And this is Branch Avenue
17	northbound.
18	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: What time
19	of day is this?
20	MR. MEHRA: Pardon me?
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: What time
22	of day is this?

1	MR. MEHRA: 8:00 a.m. in the
2	morning at 7:56 a.m.
3	Here, 30 th and Alabama. And this
4	is the new intersection that was going to be
5	created across the shopping center and the
6	main street at Alabama and Good Hope. And as
7	you can see, a lot of these vehicles are all
8	trying to turn right onto Good Hope.
9	This is Naylor Road, Alabama
10	Avenue, and here's the 25 th Street approach.
11	This is Good Hope approaching 25 th . Here are
12	the cues. That is the cue along 25 th .
13	When you summarize the data the
14	average speed in the network, in that whole
15	area that you looked at is 4 miles per hour.
16	Thank you.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me just say,
18	Mr. Mehra, we want to be able to access this
19	quickly. We may have some more questions for
20	you
21	MR. MEHRA: Definitely.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: once the

presentation is over	er
----------------------	----

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you. We'd like to present Ronald Coal.

MR. COLE: Good evening,
Commissioners, Chairman Hood. I'm Ronald
Coal, as Marty said. I live at 2933 Fort
Baker Drive currently. I was born and raised
in Hillcrest, live at 34th and Alabama Avenue.

We purchased our new home in February 2006, and completed an extensive renovation of the property with the intent of living and contributing to this community for many years to come. Since that time we have experienced the quiet enjoyment of our home, which as you are aware is nestled behind the existing Skyland Shopping Center.

When the redevelopment of Skyland was originally considered, we did not anticipate that the project would require a zoning reclassification of the transitional R-5-A Zone between the existing Skyland and Fort Baker Drive to C-3-A.

NEAL R. GROSS

Nor did we expect that a WalMart building, identified in plan as Block 1, as well as other mixed-use structures identified as Block 4, would be proposed for development within such close proximity to our homes.

The impact of these monolithic structures hovering nearly 60 feet over our Fort Baker residences will be magnified exponentially by the topography and elevation of the proposed site. The proposed Block 1 is just about 330 feet long, and the proposed is roughly 237 feet long. Blocks 1 and 4 are essentially contiguous, this will create a near-continuous wall that is roughly the length of two football fields behind our homes. Let's call it the Great Wall of Hillcrest.

Before I continue Ι'd like to paint picture for you. Just before nightfall Ι sat at my dining room preparing this testimony. From my dining room I looked out of my windows into a calm and

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

tranquil wooded backyard, taking in the panoramic view. The natural light that was peeking through the tree canopy at the top of the hill on the other side of the ravine was quickly beginning to fade. And despite the chill in the air Ι cracked the window slightly, just to listen.

What I heard was very unique for an urban setting. Birds chirping, the occasional small animal moving about on the ground or in the trees. Now, of course an occasional car drove up Fort Baker but other than that, quiet. This is the grand appeal of our Fort Baker Drive enclave. In my humble opinion it is an urban oasis.

Having said that, I do understand that the redevelopment of the Skyland Shopping Center is a high priority for the city. But while the city and local community might desire this type of economic development fundamentally, this project as currently proposed goes too far and should be scaled

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

back to fit the character of this low density residential neighborhood.

While the developer might argue that scaling back raises profitability and viability concerns, I would counter that argument with the fact that the developer will pay \$1 for the property and will control the leasing and management of the site perpetuity along with the which, incentives that the city will likely offer, will most certainly prove to be exceedingly for developer profitable the effective life of the project. In effect, we are talking degrees of profitability for the developer versus potential adverse impacts on the long-term community residents, the taxpayers.

For these reasons as well as others I will discuss, I am in opposition to the rezoning application that is currently under consideration.

The overwhelming size and scope of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the proposed project will create significant negative impacts related to traffic, light and air quality, security and safety issues, environmental issues, and concerns related to property values. While this list is not exhaustive, it should be sufficiently illustrative of the gravity of my concerns.

traffic expert has provided Our specific and convincing detail regarding the fundamental flaws in the traffic by the developer's traffic presented Additionally, both the Office of consultant. Planning and DDOT have raised some concerns with the study. So to this point, I am done.

with regards to light Now, proposed WalMart as air, the well as the mixed-use structures on Block 4 and their retaining walls will tower over my home due to the general topography of the site This will obscure the clear view mentioned. currently enjoy that Ι as previously described, a definite adverse impact. It will

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

literally block out the sun.

Moreover, the proposed rooftop parking and its requisite security lighting will create a halo or stadium effect that much of Fort Baker Drive and some of W Street will be forced to experience, particularly during the early evening and nighttime hours.

As such, the evening view from both the rear and westernmost end of my home will be dominated by a large wall of some sort and an unnatural or manmade glow where only the tree canopy and natural light currently exist.

The parking aspect of the plan is particularly troubling for several reasons as well. First, per the developer's most recent accommodation, the access to the parking is now to be situated along the interior of the easternmost edge of the WalMart. As the parking will be on the roof, the consistent rumbling of the numerous car engines, screeching tires, and blaring horns will still

NEAL R. GROSS

be audible to me and the other Fort Baker residents from our backyards. Not to mention the noxious emissions and other pollutants that will surely rain down on our lower lying homes. As such, parking creates both a noise and environmental hazard.

Lastly but equally as important as the other concerns raised is the security or safety aspect related to the potentiality of having this out of scale commercial-use operating directly adjacent to the lower density residential low properties along Fort Baker. Over the years it has not been at all uncommon for individuals evading the police to flee the Skyland Shopping Center over the existing fencing and through the wooded areas to the east in the direction of Fort Baker Drive. In fact, neighbors have on numerous occasions observed these individuals using their backyards as an escape route.

The theory is that by eliminating the current transitional area between the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

commercial and the existing residential, it becomes even more likely that someone eluding law enforcement will be within yards of our homes and our families if not quickly apprehended. This poses an obvious safety concern and potential hazard.

Ultimately these concerns and the eventual development of the project as proposed will have adverse impact on the goodwill that we currently hold in our homes, including but not limited to negative impacts on our property values.

While this point seems contrary to conventional thoughts surrounding redevelopment efforts and the increases property values generally attributable community amenities, these types of the proposed rezoning would change the status of home in that the R-1-B low density my residential zone will no longer be adjacent to a transitional residential zone R-5-A, which currently serves as our buffer. Rather, it

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

will be situated next to a C-3-A commercial zone. Additionally, the WalMart and mixed-use development on proposed Block 4 will be the neighbor at my immediate southwestern property

So while other Hillcrest residents might realize a slight boost in value for their properties, my recently purchased and renovated home will suffer unique and severe adverse impacts in this regard.

So Ι understand it, amongst other things, this Commission is charged with the responsibility of ensuring that the city zoning, both existing and proposed, supports compatible uses and appropriate transitional zones between these uses, particularly between family residential single and biq box uses, thereby commercial protecting the taxpaying citizens of the District of Columbia from uses that create adverse impacts on their homes and/or their persons.

The adoption of the proposed

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

line.

zoning reclassification would essentially pave the way for the developers to build a 135,000 square foot WalMart, and possibly down the other related structures at extremely close proximity to our property lines. The proposed WalMart with its noncompliant rooftop enclosures and rooftop parking will be roughly 110 feet, a mere 37 plus or minus yards, and quite literally a stone's throw or bottle's throw, away from my home and family.

Commissioners, as Mr. Sullivan mentioned at the last hearing, the building that you see from the window behind you just across 3rd Street, that's 108 feet. This is just about the distance from my deck to the proposed Great Wall of Hillcrest.

The existing zoning already allows for the most responsible development of the proposed site and is fully supportive of more appropriate transitional uses, like lower density residential or open space. Based on

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	this, I again must voice my most strenuous
2	opposition to the rezoning application as
3	currently proposed. You are the gatekeeper in
4	this regard.
5	I appreciate your time. Thank
6	you.
7	MR. SULLIVAN: Can we stop the
8	clock for a second while he gets the computer
9	ready?
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Sure.
11	MR. PUCKREIN: Thank you very
12	much. My name is Gary Puckrein. I reside at
13	2929 Fort Baker Drive. I want to voice my
14	opposition. I'm going to put it in the
15	context of the PUD.
16	I think that the proposed PUD,
17	sorry, violates the Comprehensive Plan and
18	other public policies. That the applicants
19	haven't produced sufficient evidence to allow
20	the Commission to determine the public benefit
21	of the proposed PUD. The evidence often

PUD

would

the

indicates

that

а

have

substantial public harm. And I would also say, I think as you'll see in the presentation, there are potential legal limitations to the rezoning of this property.

First, I want to talk about soil erosion in the context of the Comprehensive Plan of the Fort Baker buffer, and then say quickly a little bit about what the community wanted. So on the soil erosion, specifically the PUD speaks about soil erosion and particularly points out the Skyland/Alabama area.

I know this Commission has heard a lot about God's Dump. It actually has a history. In 1978 Courtney Malloy did a story in the Washington Post. Apparently a gentleman by the name of Andrew God, a developer, looked at that land and decided that he wanted to build homes back there. And he decided to turn it into a dump site in order to fill in the land.

There actually was a lake back

NEAL R. GROSS

there, a stream back there, that he wanted to close off. And what he did was he opened up a dump-for-fee site in which Metro dump was back there but there was also trash, the neighbors say, the people who lived in that area. And

there's potential contaminants in the area.

What happened was the residents of the area, those living in the four homes that we live in next to what is proposed Skyland, actually had to file suit because they came to the city, including this Zoning Commission, and said this guy has an unregulated dump site. And the city refused to do anything about it.

And what ended up happening is that Kenneth Mundy, I'm sure a lot of you know Kenneth Mundy, filed a lawsuit for the residents. And actually also, according to this letter, jointly filed against the city. In the process of that lawsuit two studies were done by George Washington University. We have copies of that study. And the studies

NEAL R. GROSS

pointed out that that dump site was going to erode the foundation of the existing homes because it was moving that stream of water towards the homes. And they anticipated that it would erode the foundation of homes and also would have consequence for future development, because it unengineered dump site, unengineered an landfill. In other words he didn't compact it, he just did what he wanted to do to a lot of the trash and stuff back there.

In 1979 the city finally filed suit against Andrew God. And there was a consent order in which he was supposed to clean up that site. So a lot of that elevation that you see there now should have been cleaned up if the city had enforced the consent decree, but they did not.

The threat to the homes were realized. Part of the reason why the Fort Baker group is here is because our houses now sit on stilts, on helical piers because of the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

erosion that was a consequence of that dump. Each of us has put substantial amount of money on those stilts. And we have said repeatedly to the developer, look, this is an unusual situation. Our houses are not on firm foundation.

There's also this whole issue of low density. And the PUD is very explicit. It says that the neighborhood is sure that the Comprehensive Plan and zoning designations for these neighborhoods reflect and protect the existing low density land use patterns while allowing for infill development that is compatible with the neighborhood.

Also the PUD says that the property owners on Fort Baker Drive, they should be working with them to maintain a visual, sound, and security buffer between the shopping center and the residential homes. The ANC as you've heard has also taken side with the Fort Baker Drive residents in terms of a buffer. So you have two government

NEAL R. GROSS

agencies now that have spoken out very clearly.

So this picture here, that's my house back there. That's the top of the hill. That's what we're talking about in terms of proximity to our homes. Our property line is probably somewhere around here, right?

And here is where they want to put a 60 foot structure. Obviously, it's going to block out all of the light over here. You're going to see it. And this is another home on Fort Baker Drive. You're going to see it; it is going to tower over that community without a doubt. And so we're looking at this.

Also we're saying, you see down here this hole? That's part of that uncompacted landfill that the developer threw there back in 1979. If the developer comes here and starts compacting this, it doesn't take a physics major to understand that this is going to expand out towards our home.

And what we are concerned about is

NEAL R. GROSS

that once you give them license, they go back there, they start compacting, our homes stand in jeopardy. And what we've constantly said to the developer is we don't want to take that We don't need to take a risk. risk. in quiet enjoyment of our homes and we don't see why we need to take a risk. Because we know the minute you go back there, our houses are already on stilts, you're going to destroy And we're going to end up in court fighting over whether they destroyed them or Meanwhile, we don't have a place And that's an uncautionable thing to live. ask anybody.

What the community wants and what we're not against is a shopping center back there. That's what the proposal was. There was no proposal about 500 apartments and a WalMart and 1,600 parking spaces and traffic out the wazoo. Nobody's been asking for that.

What people have been saying is, I want a hardware store, I want a cinema, I want

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

a bookstore, I want to go to a restaurant. That's what they envisioned for Skyland. And that is what the developer promised in the court filings in the eminent domain case.

Specifically, it says the developer agreed to build, lease, and operate a retail center containing a non-grocery store anchor tenant and not in excess of 50,000 square feet. That's what everybody understood was going back there.

Let me stop by saying what we're asking for in this project is out of scale with the community. And we're basically saying look, let's get this thing so it comports with the Comprehensive Plan, integrates into the community so that we can have the retail center that we're looking for.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, that was very well done, and all the presentations were very well done. We actually have adopted City Council's switches, we don't have any

NEAL R. GROSS

1 demonstration whether you agree or disagree. 2 I'm sure Chairman Gray would 3 appreciate that we do -- we're going to stop 4 the clock, but the clap took a little while 5 So we would ask that we abide by that 6 rule also, whether you agree or disagree. 7 I'm sure the Chairman would agree with us with 8 that. 9 So could we stop the clock? How 10 many minutes did you -- I gave you 5, You'll get those 10 seconds. 11 seconds? watch the football and they say put them 10 12 13 seconds back on the clock; we'll do that. 14 Okay. 15 MS. SIBERT: Good evening. My 16 is Karen Siebert and I reside at 2937 Fort Baker Drive. The Hillcrest community is 17 a quiet, advertent cluster of well-kept homes 18 19 that offers many of the advantages of suburban 20 living in an urban setting. My husband Dennis and I moved our 21

family here from the area near North Capitol

Street and Florida Avenue in search of a neighborhood where our children could grow and develop without being constantly exposed to noise, unsanitary conditions, unsavory characters, violence, and the 24/7 activity that constitutes living in a concrete jungle.

We have lived on Fort Baker Drive for nearly 20 years not without some of the annoyances that come with urban living: occasional vandalism and annoying overall it But has been serene and satisfying existence.

Although just short we are distance from the bustling commercial situated behind our home that is the Skyland Shopping Center, we have been able to enjoy our surroundings with little intrusion from the world that exists over the hill. due in large part to the natural wooded area known as God's Lot or God's Dump, that serves barrier between the commercial as establishments residential and our

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

neighborhood.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

have lived For as long as we there, I have followed closely and supported plans for redeveloping Skyland Shopping Center, which currently is indeed an unsightly blight on the community. As I understood it, the goal was to replace the existing shopping center with services that the community was believe craving. And Ι the appropriate project can help improve the character of the neighborhood and provide needed services and retail for residents. But as designed it poses significant problems, both real and potential, that must be resolved before it is allowed to go forward.

My neighbors and I come before you this evening to ask you to address these issues thoughtfully and thoroughly, and not to approve this planned unit development and Zoning Map Amendment until such time as revisions are made to eliminate any potential hazards to the existing residents. Among our

1 concerns: traffic, noise, lighting, security, 2 and environmental impacts. 3 Consider the adverse impacts of 4 allowing an existing natural barrier to be 5 eliminated between the four homes abutting the 6 area of commercial development, which we have 7 been told will consist of a big box retailer 8 and parking facility. From our vantage point these impacts include: 9 10 (1) Causing further damage to the already frail structural integrity of 11 12 homes; 13 (2) Affecting the market value of 14 our homes; 15 (3) Transferring the risk 16 associated with the project to homeowners, 17 and; (4) Destroying the quiet enjoyment 18 19 of our homes. 20 believe that the development involved in building a big box retail store 21 22 with an accompanying parking facility in close proximity to us will likely cause considerable damage to the structural foundations.

It is no secret that the soil conditions in this area are problematic as it pertains to construction. As a matter of fact, the city has acknowledged this area as an erosion hot spot.

In addition, we have recently learned of city actions in the 1970s to permit dumping-for-fee in this area, as well as the presence of an underground stream. Small wonder that our foundations are not as stable as they should be.

Our experience over the years with this problem has required us to invest large sums of money to reinforce our foundations and repair frequent and seasonal cracks due to the expansion, retraction and erosion of the soil, as well as the effects of storm water runoff all of which have taken a toll on our properties and our purse strings.

And since our structures are

NEAL R. GROSS

already distressed from previous settlements, it is reasonable to assume that our homes are that much more susceptible to damage, a point made by the developer's geotechnicial engineer in a report that was presented to the community.

It should be noted, however, that the engineer's report only addresses the impact of dynamic compaction to improve the soil within the footprint of the development.

It does not take into consideration how the consistent movement of people and machines, grading, construction and ongoing operations at the site will further affect the delicate structural conditions that exist as well as our peace, privacy, and security.

And it is clear that no comprehensive environmental study will be undertaken to explore the true extent of the impact that this development will have on the community at large until after the Zoning Commission has approved this PUD.

Given the variety of issues that remain to be addressed to our satisfaction, it's not without merit to consider that we may not wish to remain in these homes construction of the town center. In effect, barring any legal or regulatory relief or an agreement between the parties, we may find it necessary to relocate to avoid the negative effects of this development. As such, believe that the market values of our homes will be reduced significantly as the pool of buyers willing to purchase properties adjacent to this construction may be small if nonexistent.

In addition, as sellers we have a duty to disclose the fact that our homes may be in jeopardy due to the proximity of this project, or if construction has already begun we would have to disclose any material defect or damage that may occur as a result. In the current economy this most certainly will taint the attractiveness of our homes and give

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

potential buyers pause.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

In essence, unless the government necessary action to protect takes the investment and provide some relief by requiring that the project be scaled back, we will find ourselves devoid of any other option other than to grin and bear it, unacceptable and onerous position.

As homeowners and taxpayers we are being asked to make the ultimate sacrifice: The sanctity of our homes for the benefit of the developer who stands to reap huge financial benefits from this project for many years to come. In contrast, we have only one opportunity to enjoy uninterrupted use of our homes. We will have only one opportunity to recoup our investment through the sale of our homes.

The citizens of the District of Columbia are the owners of this land that will be transferred to the developer at the cost of \$1. Clearly, the developer is the party best

positioned with the resources to address the concerns that plague this project. Why, then, are we homeowners being asked to assume risk that bear no positive outcomes for us?

Smith and Rappaport Companies may indeed be reputable and scrupulous businesses, but we have no reason to believe that any guarantees made might be fulfilled without legal enforcement. Why should we be expected to wait until some calamity happens and subject ourselves to pursuing costly legal action to force the developer to fix what could have been avoided in the first place? It is not at all clear to me why we should be put in a position to bear any risk whatsoever. We are not partners in this endeavor and the end game offers no tangible benefit for us.

In any case, our view is that this project constitutes a private nuisance in that we will experience a loss of quiet enjoyment of our property, whether related to noise and activity during construction or more

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	permanently the aspects of lighting, security,
2	privacy, and traffic. As a result we find
3	ourselves in an undesirable and untenable
4	situation, but one not without resolution.
5	You can deny this application as currently
6	presented and protect the citizens whom you
7	serve by requiring the necessary revisions to
8	ensure that we may coexist unencumbered by
9	commercial interests, as we have for so many
10	years.
11	I thank you for your time and
12	attention.
13	MS. BROCK-SMITH: Good evening,
14	Chairman and members of the Commission. My
15	name is Cynthia Brock-Smith. I live in the
16	2900 block of Fort Baker Drive, directly
17	behind Block 4 and diagonally across from
18	Block 1 of this development.
19	I endorse the comments of my
20	neighbors, so I won't repeat many of the
21	things that they have said. I agree that the

traffic study is flawed, that the buffer zone

is not adequate.

I want to pay closer attention though to the issue of the condition of the slope between Fort Baker Drive and the Skyland development, because I think it has a direct impact on the decisions that you're going to make here today as part of the Commission's decision on the PUD.

This filing has a particular impact on the property known as God's Dump. It was a property that was used as an illegal dumping operation in the 1970s by Andrew God and the Northgate Corporation. This is part of the wooded buffer zone that's currently between the homes on Fort Baker Drive and the Skyland property.

Apparently, the city gave the permission for the owners to fill the area, including Austin Street which is a paper street that runs between Fort Baker Drive and Skyland. Originally it was an illegal dump. They were dumping Metro debris and other

hazardous materials.

The illegal dumping operation and movement of the earth in this area caused damage to some of the properties on Fort Baker Drive, and an injunction was filed, a consent decree issued and the project was eventually abandoned as my neighbor has explained to you.

One of the things I notice as a part of the consent decree, Mr. God was supposed to remove the fill and regrade the area. And it doesn't appear that that's been done, and it's caused major erosion problems over the years.

A natural underground spring was covered up by this dumping. And as a part of the consent decree, it was indicated that if that spring was uncovered, there were certain mitigation that should take place by the Northgate Corporation to avoid any further erosion or water damage to the adjacent properties.

The city stood on the sidelines in

the 1970s while an illegal dump operation decimated what was a forest behind Fort Baker Drive and turned it into this dump. Mature trees were removed, resulting in constant erosion problems that persist today.

The George Washington University geology survey of this property indicated that trees were being cut down along the sides of the ravine along Fort Baker Drive with evidence that the tree stumps would The report suggested that the stumps of these trees as well as the underbrush would decompose, leaving behind cavities in the earth which would become sinkholes and would conducive to beginning soil slump landsliding.

That is exactly what has happened over the years and continues to happen, and in some places the natural spring has been totally covered up by landslides and forest underground. I've heard from the applicant that this is just rainwater runoff. And in an

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

interview of the residents who have been there
for 30 years indicate that they used this

3 natural spring for fresh water 50 years ago.

So it's still there and it's still causing some issues on the property. Although it may not be exactly on the Skyland property, I think movement of the earth between Skyland and Fort Baker would cause additional problems.

The adverse impacts during the activity on the property behind Fort Baker Drive during the 1970s caused considerable damage to some homes, precipitated flooding in the streams. It caused erosion on the hill and the water table to rise, and that is the cause of some of the flooding I think that some of the homes on Akron Street experience even today.

This area leads directly through the property lines of Fort Baker on the steep slope where the foundation of the big box was originally intended to be constructed. It

NEAL R. GROSS

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

should never have been considered for development and should not be developed now.

I endorse the original concept of renovation of this property as а retail I participated in some of shopping center. the charrettes and a lot of the meetings with the developers. I raised issues with the city of well with representatives as as developers early on about the issues connected with this slope and potential damage to homes on Fort Baker Drive. And I was always waved away with, "Oh, our engineers will take a look at that. We'll make sure that there won't be any damage." I'm not comfortable with that.

The expert testimony presented by the Department of Environmental Services in the 1970s on how the landfill area on God's Dump would adversely impact adjacent properties was made a part of that record at that time.

While I realize that the environmental impact statements are prepared

NEAL R. GROSS

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

later in this process, I am concerned about the history. And that history will repeat itself, and additional damage would come to these homes when this property is rezoned from residential to commercial.

In closing, I join my neighbors in opposing the project. I think the size and scope of this project is much larger than originally envisioned when the concept was brought to the Hillcrest neighborhood.

Implementation of this plan as currently proposed would tread on my rights and the adjacent property owners' rights. Why should I lose my home so the rest of the community will enjoy the amenities that we all surely deserve? I support bringing new amenities to the Hillcrest area. I just don't support them at the cost of losing my home.

I urge you to make a decision that will protect our interests, as well as allow the developer to go forward without doing any more damage to these properties.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Thank you.

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you.

I'd like to sum up and just point out that we believe the PUD application has at least three major problems. First being traffic, and I won't go into detail there but you have the testimony of our traffic expert.

The second is the inconsistency with the Comprehensive Plan. And I would break this out into really three separate sections.

There's the general provisions of the Comprehensive Plan which talk about what's desired for Skyland specifically. And the overwhelming weight of those sections talk about something that is just retail. There's some hint of a residential component description of the map. But every specific section that talks about Skyland, and there's four or five of them, talk about communityscale retail center or the need for retail, never mentions housing or big box retail.

The second section and third section are the very specific provisions related to Fort Baker Drive, which are the soil erosion issue and the requirement for a

suitable visual, sound and security buffer.

Now, I'm sure you're familiar with the principle of statutory construction that says when you have statute that а different provisions that in are conflict, these specific provisions dominate over the general provisions. And we have here the two most specific provisions. And the provision buffer may be the most for the specific provision in the Comprehensive Plan as it relates specifically to these four homes. I think that's the major inconsistency, and that's what we're talking about is the visual impact.

And if I could on that point briefly just ask a question of Mr. Cole. There was some confusion about whether the community has seen enough renderings or enough

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	pictures, and that they don't really have an
2	idea of what this is going to look like. And
3	maybe you could help explain that, what some
4	of those concerns are.
5	MR. COLE: Well, with regards to
6	I wish I had some, I do have pictures. But
7	anyway, basically from our homes, our
8	perspective from our vantage point we're going
9	to basically see a wall.
LO	I respectfully reference Ms.
L1	Steingasser who last week mentioned that the
12	wall with its trees or whatever covering it,
L 3	would have a bucolic appearance. And I
L4	MR. SULLIVAN: I believe that was
15	the architect. Sorry.
L6	MR. COLE: No, I'm pretty sure it
L7	I wouldn't forget that. But nevertheless,
L 8	even if it were the architect and I misspoke,
L 9	I apologize.
20	But bucolic, I had to actually
21	look it up, but it means pastoral and more of
2.2	a natural nature appearance. It doesn't

become more bucolic then what we have back there right now. So it's basically -- it doesn't really add up.

The other thing that's very important that we think is essential to this whole analysis, which we haven't been permitted authority to undertake at this point, is the balloon test.

At, I guess, the first hearing it came up and I think it was Mr. May, I'm not sure, but someone basically brought it up. Take some pictures to show what the views and vistas would be from the various Fort Baker homes. Conveniently, the developer decided to take one picture from W Street at the intersection of Fort Baker and W, which didn't give any perspective from our particular homes.

We would contend that the balloon test would be a definitive viewpoint or vantage point of what the visual impact would be, not only of our perspective from our

NEAL R. GROSS

particular homes to the tops of the big box building, but also more importantly it would also give the perspective of what anyone on top of that roof would see peering down on our homes. And also with the lighting that will be atop the parking deck as well, or the rooftop parking as well.

So those are just some things that we think we should still be allowed to, I guess, enter into the record at some point since it wasn't done by the developers.

It's also pretty interesting that we've been forced to come out of our pockets to foot the bill for all of this. We're more than willing to do it because we have to protect our interests. But I think at the very least, we should be allowed to do these types of tests and studies to make sure that our interests are protected.

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you. I'll jump back to the third major problem with the application, and that's the public benefits.

NEAL R. GROSS

The annotated table required by Section 2403.11 says that the public benefits offered must be superior in quality and quantity to typical development of the type proposed. And I believe the ANC asked for a breakdown of the difference between, as Mr. Jenkins said, what they're obligated to do anyway and what they're not obligated to do. And nobody's ever seen that.

Particularly there's the Green features that make up more than half of the \$9.2 million. DDOE identified them "as required." We can take that off the list if that's the case.

The bus commuter store is listed for \$250,000 and it came out in the last hearing that that's not money expended by the applicant; that's a DDOT budget and it's not confirmed in their budget. It's not guaranteed; we don't even know if the funds are there. But we know the applicant's not paying them, which calls into question really

NEAL R. GROSS

all the numbers on this sheet. I don't know if that applies also to the transportation infrastructure public and the space improvements, and maybe it's impossible to Because any funds that the applicant know. expends they could end up getting from the city anyway, because the project subsidized. So I think there's an issue with those public benefits.

Also, the build-out subsidy. It's not unusual for a landlord to subsidize build-out and then take it back in rent. I don't know that that's really a \$500,000 benefit. The contractor alone fund \$300,000; that's not a payment of \$300,000 to anybody. That's a payment to a contractor for services rendered, albeit a little sooner than they would get it under the draw.

In closing, I just want to say we appreciate all the comments from the supporters of the project and their opinion that this issue should be resolved as well

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

with these homes and Fort Baker Drive.

I think the applicant -- well, I don't know what the applicant thinks. But if they did think this was a foregone conclusion, I can see how they would think it's not really in their interest to try to resolve the issue with the Fort Baker Drive neighbors. And that's why the Fort Baker Drive party needs the Zoning Commission.

It is in your power to cause the applicant to cause such a resolution with my clients. And without your help at this point, we're at the mercy of the developer. There may be a WalMart the distance to the Tax Court building away from my clients. That's not a win/win for us. It's too much to lose. So we respectfully request that you hear our concerns. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I want to thank this panel. I think from my standpoint, before I start talking about amenities or anything else, I would tell you I'm very

concerned about some of the comments that I've heard. I will tell you I'm sitting here grappling with how to proceed. Because I can tell you, as my colleagues know, previously we've had houses, you know people with investments in their houses, that means a lot, at least to this Commission and I believe to my colleagues also. How do we work that out? The city and I think some citizens would like to see that. But then those are those homeowners who live there.

We've had one particular case, I'm just going to say this, where I asked the developer to go back and save this gentleman's house. Because that means a lot. I mean, I put myself in that position and I think a lot of times we often do that up here.

So even before I get to the amenities, I'm having a problem with something I think Mr. Puckrein, when he showed me that picture about how close it's going to be, I'm having some issues there. How do I get around

1	and resolve it, I'm not sure yet. I'll be
2	frankly honest.
3	And Ms. Schellin, I will tell you
4	that if this Commission is still here, what we
5	need to do when we deliberate is have this at
6	a meeting where we don't have much. Because I
7	think this is going to take a lot of
8	discussion, a lot of conversation, and it's
9	going to take some time.
LO	MR. SULLIVAN: Excuse me, Chairman
11	Hood, if I
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm talking to my
13	Commissioners now.
L4	MR. SULLIVAN: All right.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You turned it over
16	to me but if you want to take it back over,
L7	I'll turn it back over to you.
18	MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, I
L 9	appreciate it.
20	We were going to ask if the record
21	could be held open to do a balloon test at our
22	expense, and hopefully that would be helpful

	ł I		
1	ł I	tο	77011
	ł I		you

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Sullivan, we haven't even gotten to that point, but you know what, we might --

MR. SULLIVAN: Just while you're on the subject, I thought I'd mention it.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me just say this, let me help you out. We might ask the applicant to do that, but since -- and I think I've heard Mr. Cole mention how the burden has been on them about retaining legal counsel. And I know my colleague has already asked for a perspective, but as was mentioned, we only got one side of it. We may need that whole view and I don't know if we got that. Tummonds I'm sure will let us know if already have that and he can direct us That may be something that we may ask But let's just wait and see how this plays out.

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: But anyway, I will

1	tell you that gives me great caution and pause
2	from especially the slide that I saw. But let
3	me do this.
4	Mr. Puckrein, can you put back up
5	the slide where you showed me I think it
6	looked like there was a hole in the ground?
7	But let me ask Mr. Cole and maybe
8	Ms. Smith and others, what's going on over
9	there now? I think I know, but what's going
LO	on over there now on this site?
11	MR. PUCKREIN: It's still in the
12	state it was back in 1979 when it was an
13	unengineered dump site. And that's why when
L4	the arborist went to drill, she couldn't
L5	drill. Because there's cement holes and
L 6	pockets all over the place. Nobody goes back
L7	there, really.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. That's
L9	their part, I understand that; we're going to
20	get there. But I mean on the site of the
21	proposal, what's going on over there now?
22	MR. PUCKREIN: You're talking

1	about on the Skyland site?
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: The Skyland site,
3	right.
4	MR. PUCKREIN: As best we know,
5	it's fenced in. We've been trying to get our
6	balloon specialist over there so we could do
7	the balloon test. What we understand
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So it's fenced in?
9	MR. PUCKREIN: the city's got
10	it in lockdown.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: But it was fenced
12	in some time ago? Was there an Autozone or
13	some type of
14	MR. PUCKREIN: Yes. But that was
15	recessed back. That is where Skyland used to
16	be. What the developer is talking about is
17	moving it forward closer to our property.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I understand that
19	part; I understand that part. But I just want
20	to know is there any activity going on on the
21	site now?
22	MS. BROCK-SMITH: Can I speak to

that? If you're talking about what's actually -- any commerce going on, there's the Autozone that's still open, there's a CVS, there's a laundromat, there's a liquor store, there's an abandoned Post Office, a Murray's Steak House.

But all of those are around in a circle that's not in close proximity to our homes. So right now it doesn't really impact us. The current activity, and there's activity from early in the morning until at least 10:00 or 11:00 at night, it doesn't impact us because it's not as close as this development is planned.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And that was my question because I'm trying to make sure I have my orientation correct.

MS. SIBERT: Commissioner Hood, may I add a little perspective to that? The Post Office that operated there frequently had loading and unloading throughout the course of night and day. While we could hear that sound at 2:00 in the morning where there was no

NEAL R. GROSS

1	other sound to compete with it, it seemed a
2	distant sound. That's how far back the Post
3	Office was set. So with all of their big
4	trucks coming in loading and unloading, we
5	basically didn't hear much of that activity
6	because the setback was so far from our homes.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Help me with my
8	orientation. The Post Office, and I don't
9	know if you have a site plan in front of you,
10	maybe Mr. Sullivan could help would it be
11	in relationship to Block 1, 4, or 3?
12	MS. SIBERT: Block 5.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Block 5? The Post
14	Office?
15	MS. SIBERT: It's between 4 and 5.
16	The depiction that Gary Puckrein had of the
17	man standing next to a house is my house, and
18	directly behind that is Block 4. And the Post
19	Office would kind of be between 4 and 5.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I've got
21	you. No, you can just tell me, I have it
22	open. Actually, I'm on page 33; I think we

1	may be on the same page; 35? Turn your
2	microphone on.
3	MS. SIBERT: If you look at page
4	35 and you look at Block 5, if you move down
5	to where the arrow stops almost, that is
6	directly behind my home.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
8	MS. SIBERT: And so the other
9	homes are situated behind Block 4 and I'm
10	sorry, this says Block 4. Oh, yes. And Block
11	1 at the very last house.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I guess where I'm
13	going is when the Post Office and those other
14	properties, which Ms. Smith said is kind of
15	far away, existed or exists now is there a
16	fence or something? What's stopping me from
17	coming over to your street; what's stopping
18	me?
19	MS. SIBERT: Well, when the Post
20	Office was in operation there was a fence
21	there. But also it was quite a distance. I
22	mean, you could get to my home from there, but

1	it was quite a distance. It wasn't just like
2	getting to the top of the hill and looking
3	over and seeing my home.
4	I would say it was probably, just
5	a rough measurement, 60 or 70 feet from the
6	top of the hill to where the end of the Post
7	Office parking lot where the asphalt began,
8	not the physical building, but the asphalt
9	behind the Post Office began.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Mr.
11	Cochran? Is it Cochran? Puffman?
12	MR. PUCKREIN: Puckrein.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Puckrein? I got
14	that wrong.
15	MR. PUCKREIN: That's all right.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Puckrein. How
17	do you spell your last name, Mr. Puckrein?
18	MR. PUCKREIN: P-U-C-K-R-E-I-N.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Puckrein.
20	Okay. Can you go back to the one where
21	what is the name of the place, God's Dump?
22	MR. PUCKREIN: God's Dump? Yes.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's spelled
2	with a small G, but anyway, can you go to the
3	and what is it called again?
4	MR. PUCKREIN: God's Dump. It was
5	named after Andrew God so they called it God's
6	Dump.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. There was a
8	picture where you showed where your house was.
9	MR. PUCKREIN: Oh, this one here.
LO	That's my house right here.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Help me
12	understand, to your knowledge, where is the
13	wall going to be? And I see where your house
L 4	is.
15	MR. PUCKREIN: Yes.
L 6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's your house
L7	in the picture?
18	MR. PUCKREIN: There's no wall.
L 9	In the original plan my understanding was
20	there was going to be some sort of retaining
21	wall somewhere along here. I think it was in
22	the original plan about 100 feet from my home

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You might want to
2	stand I know that's difficult, turning your
3	back.
4	MR. PUCKREIN: Yes. So I think in
5	the original plan it would have been
6	somewhere along here would have been where the
7	retaining wall was going to be.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And Mr.
9	Puckrein, you mentioned in your testimony that
LO	I don't know whether you said your houses
11	are already on stilts or will be on will
12	stilts? I'm not sure what I heard.
13	MR. PUCKREIN: So what happened
L 4	was the side of my house, the garage, was
15	falling out. It had enormous cracks in it.
L6	We have cracks in our living room that goes
L7	from one end of the living room to the other.
L 8	In the bathroom, the tile has pulled away
L 9	from the tub. We were going to lose the
20	house.
21	So we called in some engineers who
22	nut in something called helical piers: they're

1	basically stilts. And so the house moves, it
2	shifts all the time on these piers.
3	And part of the challenge is we
4	got a 50 year or 100 year, I forget, guarantee
5	from the engineer. But the engineer said if
6	they go back there and start compacting,
7	there's no guarantee anymore. So we lose the
8	guarantee that we have on our houses right
9	now.
10	So that's part of the issue that
11	we're talking about is that by their very
12	action they eliminate a guarantee that we have
13	that we can go back to that engineer and say:
14	You didn't do the work properly; you've now
15	caused these damages to our homes.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Are you the only
17	person to have that issue?
18	MR. PUCKREIN: All of us.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Everybody has that
20	same issue?
21	MR. PUCKREIN: Everybody's got the
22	same issue. Because what happened was when

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	Andrew God what he did was he dumped on
2	that stream and moved the water. And so what
3	I think was also being said to you was not
4	only did he move the water, he cut down trees
5	and didn't remove the stumps. So he created
6	holes in the ground where water could collect.
7	On top of that, he didn't compact the soil;
8	he just dumped things back there.
9	So what's happened is that the
10	water has shifted and it's eroding the land
11	around our homes. And in order to stabilize
12	that we've had to put them on stilts.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So how many houses
14	are we talking about, six?
15	MR. PUCKREIN: Four.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Four homes?
17	MR. PUCKREIN: Yes. And that's
18	what we've said to the developer from the very
19	beginning. This is not just normal land back
20	here. There's a problem.
21	And quite honestly, the city
22	allowed if you go back and read the

testimony. I know Kenneth Davis has done a lot of work on collecting this information. But these residents went to the city back in 1974 when he started doing that dumping. And for 5 years the city didn't do anything until the houses started to fall down, and they had to bring litigation.

And part of what we think is, we actually think there was a consent decree between the landowner Andrew God and those four houses such that you can't even develop back there, which is what I was alluding to originally. We are actually searching the records now for that consent decree. Because we think that the city and the developer Andrew God entered into an agreement not to develop on that land. That's why it's been like that all these many years, because of that agreement between Andrew God and the four houses.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me open up to my colleagues. The hour is getting late

NEAL R. GROSS

1	and I would like to finish tonight, so let me
2	open ot up to my colleagues.
3	Commissioner Turnbull?
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It sounds
5	like a script for a movie.
6	I just have one question for Mr.
7	Sullivan, and it's for Mr. Mehra.
8	You've gone through a large
9	analysis going back and looking at
10	Gorove/Slade's original analysis of the site,
11	with the traffic analysis. And that's Exhibit
12	19 and specifically Tab D.
13	Do you have a submission? I mean,
14	there's tables; you reference Table 6 and the
15	others. Do you have a submission that I
16	mean, you went through a lot of refutation,
17	refuting what they said. I'm just wondering
18	is there the summary, the conclusions they
19	made do you have a corresponding document
20	that sort of we could be looking at side-by-
21	side?

MR. MEHRA: I can provide that for

1	sure.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Would you?
3	I think that would be good for us to be able
4	to have the original analysis and then your
5	sort of take on this. I think it would be
6	good for us to be able to compare that.
7	Thank you.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Turnbull, let
9	me just say what we've also done is ask Mr.
10	Mehra, has your analysis been turned over to
11	DDOT? Has Mr. Jennings had the opportunity to
12	I think it's Mr. Jennings?
13	MR. MEHRA: I believe the report
14	was submitted to you. I guess Mr. Sullivan
15	can answer that better than me.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Has his findings
17	been turned over to DDOT?
18	MR. SULLIVAN: Not with the
19	simulation, but the initial findings that we
20	filed on December 10.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So what I
22	have here in front of me tonight

1	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: has been given
3	to DDOT?
4	MR. SULLIVAN: Jeff has seen that,
5	yes.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: I just wanted
8	to comment that we have this submission from
9	December 10 which does summarize sort of the
10	conclusions. But it doesn't have many of the
11	facts that you were citing in your testimony.
12	I was trying to flip through
13	things and follow things in the report and see
14	where the numbers were different and so on.
15	And I just couldn't keep up. So it would be
16	helpful I think to have something a little bit
17	more specific than what's in here.
18	MR. MEHRA: I think as
19	Commissioner Turnbull asked, I'll put together
20	all the numbers that I mentioned, put that in
21	the report and also supply all the

backgrounds, the tables and the exhibits that

1	I referenced here.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I think
3	that would be good. Because I was kind of
4	doing the same thing, listening to your
5	comments and looking at the original report
6	and trying to go back. And I couldn't keep
7	up. I was amazed at how you were going back
8	and looking at it. So I think that kind of a
9	summary from you would very worthwhile.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Additional
11	questions?
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: Absolutely,
13	yes.
14	Let's talk first about the
15	inconsistency with the Comprehensive Plan, as
16	you testified. I'm looking at the Office of
17	Planning's report and it refers to this
18	development very specifically, and calls it
19	out for a multi-neighborhood retail. And you
20	kept referring to it as community-scale
21	retail.

NEAL R. GROSS

definition

the

And

multi-

of

neighborhood retail, and now I've list reference to it, which specifically calls out development does refer to additional this housing а component within а multias neighborhood business center. And I'm wondering why that's not consistent. I mean, it seems to me that this is consistent with that objective of the Comprehensive Plan.

Right. MR. SULLIVAN: That definition of multi-neighborhood center also says their service area is typically 1 to 3 It says the centers are generally found at major intersections and along key They include supermarkets, transit routes. merchandise general stores, drug restaurants, specialty shops, apparel stores, and a variety of service-oriented businesses. These centers may also include office space for small business, although their primary function remains retail trade. So, yes.

Again in the next paragraph it does -- I don't think multi-neighborhood means

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	residential. I think it means more than one
2	neighborhood. But it does say mixed-use
3	retail development, and that these centers
4	should be encouraged to provide new retail and
5	service and additional housing, and it does
6	mention Skyland.
7	My point was that was one
8	provision. And I could go through five or six
9	others that specifically only refer to retail.
10	And the term
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: But they don't
12	say to the exclusion of housing. I mean, why
13	is it the fact that it doesn't mention housing
14	every time but it mentions retail
15	MR. SULLIVAN: It doesn't mention
16	industrial either, but that's
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, it never
18	mentions industrial.
19	MR. SULLIVAN: Right. But I mean,
20	these other provisions
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: They're not
22	proposing industrial.

1	MR. SULLIVAN: I'm just saying the
2	weight of the weight, I think. The weight
3	of these six provisions, five of them don't
4	contemplate housing and they contemplate a
5	certain scale of retail
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. I'm not
7	sure
8	MR. SULLIVAN: that doesn't
9	include a WalMart.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: the
11	Comprehensive Plan is supposed to be read in
12	such a way that we quantify the number of
13	mentions of a particular type of use, and
14	that's how we evaluate what's appropriate or
15	what's not. It's mentioned five times versus
16	four times or, you know. If it's mentioned
17	here, it seems to me that it's not hard to
18	conclude that is consistent with the
19	Comprehensive Plan.
20	MR. SULLIVAN: I think you can
21	make the Comprehensive Plan say almost
22	anything you want it to say. So I think there

1 is a balancing of provisions, and there's five provisions that talk only about retail. 2 3 Regarding the specific more 4 provisions, though, the soil erosion and the 5 buffer, the visual impact --6 COMMISSIONER MAY: I'11 get to 7 those. 8 SULLIVAN: I rank those much higher than this one. 9 I'11 10 COMMISSIONER MAY: get to those. 11 Let's also then talk about 12 13 specific item which talks about Skyland, which its redevelopment 14 refers to as "town 15 center." And I don't know that a town center 16 is specifically defined in the Comprehensive Plan, but we're pretty familiar with the 17 notion of what a town center is. And a town 18 19 center is usually not limited to retail use. 20 It usually does include mixed-use. And so I further consistency here 21 see in this

NEAL R. GROSS

definition in this paragraph that refers to

1	Skyland.
2	MR. SULLIVAN: Right. And I would
3	just point out that I understand the word town
4	center is in there and it's followed up by the
5	explanation with more than 275,000 square feet
6	of leasable space.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. And
8	there's 315-some thousand square feet of
9	retail space that's part of this.
10	MR. SULLIVAN: That's right. So
11	the town center doesn't mention
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. It
13	doesn't say specifically how much housing
14	might be involved, but it does talk about it.
15	I am curious about when housing
16	entered into the picture in terms of this
17	development. And so I'm asking this question
18	now expecting that the applicant will
19	hopefully in rebuttal be able to talk about
20	when housing entered into the discussion.
21	Because if the Comprehensive Plan was being
22	written at a certain time and it was really

only envisioned to be a retail center, that's If it was in fact in 2006 or 2005 one thing. meetings happening when the being were discussed а mixed-use development with as housing as a component of it, I think it's harder to make the argument that this is inconsistent. So I'll let them answer that.

I am very concerned about the issues of erosion and the stability of the homes. And it's I think a very standard thing for a PUD to include protections to satisfy the concerns of the neighboring homeowners. And I think that this is probably a really exceptional case given the erosion issues and the instability of the soil, and the fact there's already a proven issue with those homes.

So I'm hoping the applicant will be able to address those concerns in the appropriate technical and legal manner to be able to address how the development might impact the homes. Again, I would ask them to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

answer that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I also will ask the applicant to talk more about the buffer. Because I've seen bits and pieces of how this notion of a buffer is being implemented here. And they gave us a good diagram on the hearing on February 4, which showed a section through the property and showed where we have 72 feet of setback to the building, and so on. But I think that it would be good to truly quantify what's there now versus what they intend to do in terms of planting, in terms of soil stabilization, in terms of security fencing because it also mentions security as part of the buffer.

Т think that the issue of providing a buffer -- I just don't have a good feeling yet of what the buffer really is to know whether you're correct and that there's not enough of a buffer, or their assertion the buffer has been provided. So hopefully they'll be able to provide more information on that.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Let's talk about the height of the
2	buildings for just a second. The way the site
3	is right now, the majority of the site is
4	currently zoned C-3-A. And a portion of the
5	site is being rezoned from R-5-B to C-3-A; R-
6	5-B according to the map I have in here.
7	MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. I think it's
8	R-5-A.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Well,
10	we'll check that. Yes, it says R-5-B in page
11	17 of the applicant's submission. I assume
12	that that's correct. We'll check that and
13	find out if in fact that's correct.
14	Did you do any examination of what
15	would be possible in R-5-B in that area in
16	terms of the potential development, the height
17	of the buildings, if it were to stay R-5-B and
18	not be rezoned as part of the PUD?
19	MR. SULLIVAN: No. No, we did
20	not.
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. I think
22	that's worth looking into, because I just did

some very quick investigation of that. And if you look at the height, the existing grade on the property of 270 feet above sea level or whatever, and you add the matter-of-right height to that of 50 feet, you're talking about 320 feet that could potentially be built in an R-5-B zone.

And it would look even more massive than that because the 50 feet is measured from the front of the building, and the front of the building would be at 270. And the back of the building, the grade drops off dramatically.

So you'd not only see the 50 feet of legal height, but as the slope goes down you'd see another 20 or 30 feet of building. And that's within 15 feet of the property line. That's what you could do as a matter-of-right. And so you wind up with an 80 foot wall 15 feet off the property line potentially versus what you have right now which is a 29 foot building that's set 70 feet back at the

NEAL R. GROSS

big box retail.

I think that there needs to be some understanding of what could be done as a matter-of-right to understand why this is being considered as a PUD. I mean, a PUD is supposed to bring better development than you can get as a matter-of-right and something that would be better for the neighborhood.

And I think that if you look at some of those things, you might find that maybe this is better than what could be done as matter-of-right. Maybe it can't, but it's an analysis that I think you might want to undertake to understand that better.

number 4. The backside of building number 4 is basically just the parking lot, or the parking garage, parking structure which goes up 20 or 30 feet above the grade there, which is at 260 or 270, something like that. So it's really only showing about 30 feet of height instead of the extra 20 that could be

NEAL R. GROSS

1	built if it was R-5-B. I don't know how close
2	it is to the property line, but it could be a
3	lot worse.
4	MR. SULLIVAN: I thought it was a
5	four or five story building.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm going by
7	the spot elevations that are shown in the
8	plans. Maybe I don't have them correct; I did
9	this very quickly here.
10	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL:
11	Commissioner May, to help you out, I looked at
12	elevation 289.5. And the ground floor in all
13	those as 252.5; I believe that's 47 feet.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: What was the
15	ground floor elevation?
16	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: 252.5.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: 252.5, and
18	that's actually 20 feet below the existing
19	grade?
20	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.
21	You're knocking off 18 feet or something.
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. So

anyway, I don't pretend to know all the answers but I think that it's something we ought to understand about this. And maybe the applicant wants to undertake some of that investigation to sort of demonstrate what the differences are. But this may be a lot better than it could be in that way.

I think a couple of people testified to the fact that these new buildings would block the sunlight from reaching your homes. Has there been any kind of analysis of that, a sunlight analysis? Okay.

If that in fact is the case, I think it would be very helpful to have that. Because that is something we can take into consideration. And sunlight studies are things that we do see regularly. Okay.

I'm also a little concerned about the lighting at night, and I think that that is a real issue that the applicant should address. I don't know that it's necessarily going to be pushing a lot of a light up.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	One of the things that happens in
2	Green building is that they try very hard to
3	keep the lighting focused down and not
4	spilling out off the site. So I don't know if
5	they really are going to do that here or what,
6	but again, maybe the applicant can provide
7	more information in that area. But I am
8	concerned about that.
9	It's an issue that we face in the
10	Park Service all of the time, the neighboring
11	buildings with light spill. And so I'm
12	sensitive to that.
13	I think that's it for my questions
14	and talking.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank
16	you.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: Did you want
18	to
19	MR. COLE: I just wanted to
20	respond to the issue of the 20 feet that would
21	be basically shaved from the site to recess
22	the building, basically.

Again, that goes to our issue with the whole foundation. Because the fact of the matter is once they get in there and start excavating that site, it's going to impact our foundations. And they mentioned a dynamic compaction technique that we've had other consultants tell us will not prevent our homes from being damaged.

effort So in an to, Ι quess, accommodate our initial desires that project be scaled back somewhat, the developer basically said, "Okay. We'll recess We'll property. move the property back another 35 feet," or whatever it was, we'll sink the property 20 feet into the fill material." Which from the beginning we mentioned to them would be unacceptable because of the risk that it would cause to our homes.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. I don't know what to make of what that potential risk is. But I think that, as I said, it's common

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to have a proffer from a developer about how they're going to address the potential risks to neighboring properties.

The more common one in a large excavation that might be happening in a more urban setting is the risks associated with dewatering the property. They dig the hole but when they dig the hole they have to pump water away from it, so it causes settlement in the surrounding homes. It's not uncommon to monitoring done have and then regular inspections and things like that to address it.

So hopefully there can be some sort of compromise on that, or some sort of solution for that, I guess is the right word.

We shouldn't be compromising about the protection of the homes.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I would just echo Commissioner May, your concern. I think it's a significant -- I think levelling the property, making it lower is in one way

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

	208
1	positive for the neighbors. And I, too, echo
2	Mr. Cole's concern about the damage to the
3	property.
4	So I think we'd like to see some
5	very specific plans from the developer as to
6	how they would want to protect those. I think
7	we need some clear indication ourselves that
8	the mitigation efforts are sufficient enough.
9	And I also echo your concern about
10	the lights. I think one of the things that's
11	been brought up is the whole amenity issue,
12	and the Green building versus what DOE
13	requires or whatever.

I'd like to have the amenity package clearly defined more: What's obligated; what is clearly an amenity; and what is LEED; what you're going for for a Green building or a Green site? I'd like to have that defined.

I'd like to have that broken down so we can really clear up. I think there's been enough questions by a lot of the

NEAL R. GROSS

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

opposition that says, what are we really getting? What's required and what are you really giving the community? I'd like to have that defined.

But I'd also like to talk about -we've talked about this garage. I'd like to
see some indication of the lighting. I'd like
to see what they're doing for the light spill,
the light pollution on the neighbors, and what
they're really going to see. I'd like to see
what kind of mitigation efforts they're going
to do. And as you say, it's common on LEED
projects. It's one of the main objectives is
that you don't have the light spill.

So I think along with either the balloon test looking, I'd like to see what these people are really going to see. I think we need a really clear picture as to what the applicant's providing and what mitigation efforts, and what it will really look like. We really haven't had that. We asked for it two hearings ago. We got a little bit last

NEAL R. GROSS

1	time, but I think we really need to go further
2	and really see that. So I would echo your
3	concern on those.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'd be happy to
5	see more information on the heights of
6	buildings.
7	On the LEED issue, I don't recall
8	what's been put in testimony already or part
9	of the record, but it may well be that this
10	project is required to be LEED certified
11	because of District funding or something like
12	that.
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: In which case
15	I'd kind of crossed that one off on my list of
16	amenities to begin with.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I will just
18	add, I know Mr. Tummonds had pointed us to the
19	Construction Management Plan. I want us to
20	refine that, especially when it comes to the
21	issue about the photo here and seeing that the
22	properties have already been permanently

damaged.

And I don't know if that's already been done, if it was in the plan. I actually sat up here for a few moments while my colleagues were talking looking for it, and I may not have it in what I have here, but I would like for us to go a little more along that Construction Management Plan if there's one. Because I think they said there wasn't one, but then I think Mr. Tummonds said there is one.

at those four homes and seeing what the damage is now versus what may happen after? Or are we looking at maybe moving that line further back away from the homes over? What are we doing to protect the interests of those four to five homes? I'm not sure; I think it's four, but four to five homes. That's one of the things I'm going to be looking for.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, there is a provision I think, for before or

NEAL R. GROSS

1	after inspections, but it's a little vague on
2	the question of monitoring during
3	construction.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And I know
5	in previous cases we have tightened that up,
6	and we've actually had those homes looked at.
7	And I think since the plan is
8	already out there, apparently from what I'm
9	being told by Mr. Tummonds, the plan is
10	already there. So we need to just tighten
11	that up a little bit and give those residents
12	some assurances to some point that if there's
13	damage that continues to go, which as I
14	understand from one of the residents that
15	their warranty will be voided if there's
16	building back there.
17	I just want to see. We need to do
18	discovery and go down that line a little bit
19	more with the Construction Management Plan.
20	That's kind of where I am.
21	Anything else you guys want to add

to that? Okay.

1	Well, let's do this. Let's go to
2	the cross-examination first before we do
3	rebuttal and closing.
4	Does the applicant have any cross-
5	examination? Mr. Tummonds, you're on the
6	ball. After all that, Mr. Tummonds has got
7	one question. You're on the ball.
8	MR. TUMMONDS: This is to Mr.
9	Puckrein. You noted that the representatives
10	of the applicant had meetings with the Fort
11	Baker Drive residents where the issues of the
12	helical piers and structural problems with
13	your homes were raised.
14	Did the applicant submit a draft
15	Construction Mitigation Agreement to the Fort
16	Baker Drive residents specifically addressing
17	the Fort Baker Drive residents' construction
18	concerns prior to the public hearing on
19	December 10, 2009?
20	MR. PUCKREIN: The applicant gave
21	us a Construction Mitigation Agreement which
22	basically said, "Your homes are already

1	damaged. We'll take some pictures. And if we
2	do any damage to them, then we will do
3	something about them." It didn't address the
4	fact that now our warranty is gone because you
5	have gone back there and dug.
6	And basically, our response to it
7	was we are not going to court, to follow you
8	in court to address damages done to our homes.
9	We don't have to do it now and we don't see
10	any reason why we have to take on the
11	responsibility of chasing you down due to
12	damages done to our homes.
13	So yes. You gave us a document
14	but it was pretty meaningless.
15	MR. TUMMONDS: I have no further
16	questions.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank
18	you, Mr. Tummonds.
19	Commissioner Richards? Okay. I
20	was about to call you Mr. Sullivan but I'm
21	sure that would have been the first time.
22	Okay. Let's do rebuttal.

MR. TUMMONDS: I think that based on the numerous questions that -- and I know it's not what Commissioner Hood wants to hear. But I think based on the numerous questions and requests for information that Commissioner May has asked for, Commissioner Hood, Commissioner Turnbull, I think it would be the most appropriate use of everyone's time is I think we need to have another hearing.

And I think that in that other can provide that information. hearing, we There can be dialogue and Mr. Sullivan can cross examine all the information we provide. think that would be But Ι the most appropriate mechanism where we can have a full dialogue about the issues you raised. I think we're doing Otherwise it all written submissions.

I think we could have the public hearing at a time after we've -- we've already talked about the need that we were going to have another presentation to the ANC, to the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	Fort Baker Drive residents so they're aware of
2	the project that is being presented is being
3	voted on. I'm looking at Commissioner Hood.
4	But I think it makes sense that we should have
5	another public hearing.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I think
7	that's a good let it be noted that Mr.
8	Tummonds set another hearing, not Anthony
9	Hood. Okay. Let's try to get schedules
10	together.
11	Ms. Schellin, if you could take
12	the lead on that?
13	MS. SCHELLIN: Did you have a date
14	to go before the ANC yet?
15	MR. TUMMONDS: I almost think that
16	realistically, with the amount of materials
17	we're looking to provide, I think we're
18	looking at a hearing date in April.
19	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay.
20	MR. TUMMONDS: So I think then if
21	we establish a hearing date in April, we can
22	work back and then that gives us plenty of

	time to work with the Fort Baker Drive
2	residents, the ANC, to have a
3	MS. SCHELLIN: April 15.
4	(Whereupon, at 10:30 p.m. off the
5	record until 10:36 p.m.)
6	MR. RICHARDS: What about April
7	21?
8	MR. SULLIVAN: April 21? April
9	21, yes.
LO	MR. TUMMONDS: We appreciate your
11	looking at a Wednesday, but April 21 would
12	work for us as well.
13	MS. SCHELLIN: Going once, going
L4	twice.
L 5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: April 21 is the
L 6	date?
L 7	MS. SCHELLIN: It's a Wednesday.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: At 6:30?
L9	MS. SCHELLIN: At 6:30.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: But it's going to
21	be a narrow scope hearing? Let's decide on
22	what all we want to be dealing with.

1 MS. SCHELLIN: We need 2 deadlines for the actual documents being due 3 and what's being asked for. And other than 4 what's being asked for, if I'm correct, the 5 will closed for all record be other 6 submissions. So that means no one else can 7 submit anything. I was out of the room some 8 of the time but I did write down some things. originally was DDOT going

address -- they had some concerns that they actually submitted a report this evening, and asked that the record be open so that they could submit -- they listed three items, I think it was, in their report. So we would want to leave the record open for them to submit those items.

I believe that DIMPED was going to submit tax and revenue values before versus projected, somewhere along those lines.

Urban Forestry had also requested that they be able to submit a small follow-up report.

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	Mr. Mehra is going to provide his
2	traffic summary or update it.
3	Mr. May asked for some more
4	information on the buffer being provided. He
5	was still a little unclear about what exactly
6	is being provided.
7	The Fort Baker group, if they have
8	it, there was some mention about the sunlight
9	blockage. So if there's been any studies,
10	they were going to provide those.
11	The applicant Mr. Turnbull
12	asked that they submit plans regarding
13	protection of the Fort Baker homes. And as a
14	follow-up, Mr. Hood asked about the
15	Construction Management Plan; does it protect
16	the interests of the Fort Baker Drive
17	properties if there's damage? So maybe a
18	combination there.
19	Mr. Turnbull also asked for the
20	lighting on top of the garage, exactly what
21	the Fort Baker neighbors will see, whether
22	that's a balloon study or some other way that

1	they're going to show that.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: Ms. Schellin,
3	can I interrupt? I think the balloon study is
4	a separate issue.
5	MS. SCHELLIN: Separate issue?
6	Okay.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: It's just the
8	height. And the lighting is not limited to
9	the
LO	MS. SCHELLIN: Garage?
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: garage.
12	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. So the
L3	lighting in general of all the buildings.
L 4	And then Mr. Turnbull asked for
L5	the amenity package to clearly define required
L 6	versus what's freely being offered, to clarify
L7	what is actually required. And I think that's
L8	it, or that's all I have.
L9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So with that
20	information, we'll be asking questions of
21	whomever we see appropriate, for any questions
22	that we may have. I'm just trying to

1	structure the hearing.
2	We will not be taking public
3	testimony. But we will be asking questions of
4	the required ones. This is kind of unusual
5	but we will be asking questions of the
6	required ones who will make submissions that
7	we may have to ask the parties. The ANC and
8	the parties will be able to cross.
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Is the
10	applicant presenting the information we're
11	requesting in written form or are they going
12	to do a presentation?
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: They're going to
14	do a small scale.
15	MS. SCHELLIN: Well, they have to
16	come back and do their rebuttal, and then
17	there's cross-examination.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So let me ask you
19	this, Mr. Tummonds, do you envision doing that
20	in a rebuttal context?
21	MR. TUMMONDS: Sure. Our rebuttal
22	is subject to cross-examination, so yes.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That will make it
2	easier.
3	MR. TUMMONDS: The information, I
4	think if we do that two weeks out? Everyone
5	submits all the information
6	MS. SCHELLIN: Well, we need to
7	have a time period for everyone to submit
8	because it's not just you guys. Fort Baker
9	people need to submit some stuff that, you
10	know, DDOT and then there needs to be two
11	weeks after that for responses there, too, for
12	the parties to be able to respond to those
13	submissions, the ANC respond to what you
14	submitted, you to respond to what Fort Baker,
15	ANC, whoever.
16	MR. TUMMONDS: And I think a
17	couple of other things that were mentioned was
18	the possible matter of right scenarios in the
19	buffer area. And we'd be interested in
20	submitting that too. I don't know if you care
21	who it comes from, as long as its there.

So one of the things the way Ms.

Schellin mentioned it was, this is required
from this person. I think what's more
important is to say these are the general
issues that you want to address. Anyone can
submit them; we'll all have the same date to
submit them. People can respond two weeks
later. On the $21^{\rm st}$ we provide our rebuttal
and there's cross-examination.
To that beaution with what were

Is that keeping with what you want, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. I think that you have -- I mean, you still have to make your rebuttal. And you can rebut pretty much anything that was testified to here, so I would certainly think you'd have some flexibility in terms of what gets presented. I mean, does that open the door for everybody to present on everything? No, I don't think so.

I agree the issues that were addressed here tonight, I think you got most of them. The only one thing is information on

NEAL R. GROSS

1	the soil stabilization, to provide the
2	construction techniques. I think that will go
3	with the idea of the Construction Mitigation
4	Agreement Commissioner Hood mentioned.
5	MR. TUMMONDS: It would be great
6	if we could actually come to an agreement
7	between now and then.
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: I agree.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think that's an
10	important point because there's a lot of time
11	between now and then. You might not reach an
12	agreement but some of those issues can be
13	hashed out. And instead of us spending four
14	hours here we may only spend two. Okay?
15	MR. TUMMONDS: Yes.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So we're
17	all on the same page?
18	MS. SCHELLIN: We need to get
19	dates.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me say
21	this, there's another issue we've asked ANC to
22	go back and

1	MS. SCHELLIN: Right. The ANC, to
2	narrow down their
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: narrow that
4	list of 21.
5	MR. RICHARDS: Right. And the
6	other thing is I asked the Deputy Mayor's
7	Office on the relative cost of the value of
8	the land after the rezoning. They said they
9	could get that but I didn't nail that down at
10	that point.
11	MS. SCHELLIN: That was on the
12	list.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That was the first
14	thing she mentioned.
15	MS. SCHELLIN: That was the first
16	said.
17	MR. RICHARDS: Okay. Sorry.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You were probably
19	working on dates when that was first
20	mentioned.
21	MR. RICHARDS: I probably was.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Let's

1	get some dates.
2	MS. SCHELLIN: So given as much
3	time as possible let me back up here. All
4	of the parties will have until I'm assuming
5	everybody wants as much time as possible
6	March 29 to provide the items requested. And
7	then each of the parties will have until April
8	12 to respond thereto.
9	Of course, the parties are the
10	only ones who can file anything at this point
11	because the record is closed for everyone
12	else. Parties are reminded that they need to
13	serve all other parties.
14	And everything is due by 3:00 p.m.
15	on those dates.
16	MR. RICHARDS: One other, we'd
17	like to meet with the Office of Planning on
18	that. Can you require that or can they
19	consent to that now?
20	MS. STEINGASSER: We're always
21	available to meet with you. Yes, sir. It
22	doesn't need to be required. We're happy to

meet with you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And by the way, I don't think I can require that. I don't think we can do that. But thank you Ms. Steingasser, you saved us.

MR. SULLIVAN: Mr. Chairman, I have one other request too. It's mentioned a couple of times the lawsuits, the two lawsuits out there. And we're searching for that information. It's in the archives and I'm told maybe we'll have it in a few weeks.

To the extent that anything in there is relevant, we'd like the opportunity to submit it. And obviously you would make that determination whether any of it is relevant.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I would actually have to talk with our OAG to see what legal ramifications we have, as far as it being within our jurisdiction because we're doing a zoning case. Anything else that happens in the court may trump whatever we do anyway.

So that's kind of where I am with 1 2 that. I don't know if the document -- you can 3 put it in the file, but I don't know if that will be something we would look at to how we 4 5 will decide on this case. 6 MR. SULLIVAN: Understood. Okay. 7 Thanks. 8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is that it?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair,

I just wanted to thank Commissioner Richards when he talked about the ANC and Hillcrest getting together. And I want to just bring that up again that we talked about the community organizations touching base with one another. As the chair has mentioned before, we like -- okay. All right. Good. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So is everything in order? We're all on the same page? And again, for the record, Mr. Tummonds we want to thank you for the great idea of another hearing. Let the record reflect it

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	was Mr. Tummonds' idea. But actually, I think
2	it was a very good idea.
3	So with that, this continuation
4	will be adjourned for the moment. I think we
5	will resume on
6	MS. SCHELLIN: Now you're going to
7	ask me again. April 21, I believe it was.
8	April 21.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: April 21 at 6:30.
10	Thank you and have a safe trip home.
11	(Whereupon, at 10:46 p.m. the
12	public hearing was adjourned.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	